

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VII

JULY, 1906

NO. 1

"Living In."

TO BE sure we all 'live in.' Do not the American girls?" was the remark made by a young woman in one of the large stores in the center of London, when I asked her as to the life of English shop girls. Further conversation with London shop "assistants" many of whom had spent several years in that position brought out a series of facts concerning the life of this class that is utterly different from anything in the American mercantile industry. Though much may be said concerning the need of the American shop girl, for seats, short hours, etc., the English assistants, besides having all these to secure has yet other troubles which are peculiarly their own. However long the hours or annoying the "floor-walker" may be to the American girl, when business closes at night she is at last free to seek her own home or to visit her acquaintances, as she may desire. Not so with the English assistant; her eating, drinking, and sleeping, equally with her work are under the close supervision of the employer.

In connection with all the large stores are great dormitories in which all the assistants, be they men or women, with or without homes of their own, are required to live. It is estimated that at least 75 per cent. of the large stores provide in this way for the housing and feeding of their employees.

Mr. S. Hobson, the English journalist, when asked concerning this practice of "living in" said: "Like so many other things in English life it is a survival. The Englishman clings to old customs and things. He is wedded to his fire-place and omnibus. So this custom of 'living in' is a remnant of the days when the apprentice boarded with his master and the small employer kept his few workmen. When the large store came in the employers

saw the advantage to them of boarding and housing their assistants, and forthwith began to do so on a large scale."

Great barracks were therefore erected for sleeping and eating purposes where the assistants are fed and lodged at an expense of from ten to fifteen cents a day, and indeed some particularly economical employers are reputed to have reduced this item of expense to as low as eight cents per day.

In some cases the house provides the food directly, but more frequently the contract is let to a professional caterer, and the employer gives the matter no further attention and allows the caterer to make all the profit possible. The food is coarse, poorly cooked, and monotonous, and badly served. One assistant bears witness to the fact that it is no uncommon thing for all to leave the table without touching the meal. There is no variation from week to week and even from year to year. One day it is "mutton hot" and the next it is "mutton cold," or the assistant may be dieted on pork for a week, while morning after morning the breakfast is made up of bread and butter or "drippings" and tea or coffee. The assistant is simply reckoned in by the employer as such and such a part of the expense, — so much for food, so much for beds, and a little over as wages for clothes and pocket money.

The outside life of the assistant may appear satisfactory, even comfortable. There may be a certain refinement about the person and surroundings of the shop-girl, and her work seem light and clean. The woman who would go shopping shabbily dressed in one of the West End shops may even be eyed coldly by these young ladies. One would naturally suppose that with their great numbers, over 700,000 in the city of London, they would be able to hold their own and like other wage-earners, show some resistance to the aggressions of employers. On the contrary their condition has either remained stationary or else actually grown worse with the passage of time.

Their hours are long, wages low, and made up by a system of premiums and uncertain commissions, and reduced by fines and deductions. They live an institutional life, eat what may be given them in the brief time allotted to them and are subject to dismissal at a moment's notice.

They must always appear neatly dressed and if a new recruit finds her clothes shabby before she has earned enough to purchase more she is very apt to find herself looking for a new position in a lower grade of shop at the East End.

But these features, however annoying, are not peculiar to "living in" and it is with that side that we are particularly interested. The bed-rooms have beds for from four to five sleepers. No choice is allowed as to room companions. There are no chairs or other furniture save the beds and a stove, no nails, hooks or

pictures allowed on the walls. Every article of clothing must be kept in a box under the bed. If any are left lying around the room they are at once confiscated. Below are a few of the rules that govern one of these dormitories.

"The house door is closed at 11 P. M., Saturdays at 12 P. M. The gas will be turned out fifteen minutes later. Any one having a light after that time will be discharged.

Assistants sleeping out without permission will be cautioned twice and discharged at the third offense.

All bedrooms to be cleared at 8 A. M.

On Sundays the bedrooms to be cleared at 10:20 A. M. and not entered again until 12:30 P. M.

Bedrooms must be kept tidy. No pictures, photos, etc., allowed to disfigure the walls. Anyone so doing will be charged with the repairs.

No assistant to enter any bedroom but her own.

No flowers to be put in water glasses or bottles.

No article of diet to be supplied unless by doctor's orders.

Strangers are not allowed to enter the house."

The law forbidding marriage is unwritten but is nevertheless a part of the "common law." A discussion once arose in Chicago as to whether the workers in the department stores of that city ought to marry on a salary of fifteen dollars a week. For the English assistant this question is all settled. He, or she is not to marry at all. Since "living in" is the invariable rule the applicant who is married stands small chance of being employed at all. If an employee does think of marrying he must keep his intentions secret. The practical result of this is that men visit their wives secretly once a week and spend the rest of their time in the barracks.

One example of the abuse here complained of is that of a man who for four years sought to obtain the permission of his employers to his marriage and who finally took the law into his own hands and was married without the desired permission only to be instantly discharged. The effects of thus forcing men and women to live through youth and even past the prime of life (for nothing is more striking to the American observer than the advanced age of the English shop-workers in comparison with those of the United States) a monastic life, need not be moralized upon.

The assistant "living in" forfeits not only his domestic but his civil rights as well. He may be twenty-one, or he may be thirty, he has no opportunity of exercising the powers of a citizen. Dr. John Clifford, president of the Christian Social Brotherhood, in a sermon on "Shop Life" said concerning this phase of the subject, "He is 'living in' and that means living out of the political realm."

After all life is made up of little things and it is the petty annoyances of the shop and the dormitories that grind the hardest. Perhaps the harshest side of this system appears in the matter of discipline. All individuality is lost. All privacy and freedom is gone and they become simply units of a subordinate class. The humiliation and helplessness of their position is felt by every man or woman with a remnant of spirit left. What must be the effect upon any person with the least atom of personal pride to be confronted every day with the following notice, posted upon the walls of that which they are forced to call home, "Trust nobody. Watch everybody. Goods are stolen every day and nobody ever catches anyone." It is a rule of the establishment that no one is to be treated as honest. Every other assistant and every customer must be viewed as a thief and looked upon with suspicion.

All these things have an added sting when accompanied by illness. Each assistant must pay twenty-five cents (one shilling) a month for the "house doctor," without whose consent no other physician is allowed to enter the house. At the end of a week's illness in the house, if the assistant has not yet recovered there is no choice but the hospital unless she happen to have friends who will take her to their home. Meanwhile she has occupied the same room with three others, — but one establishment in all London making any separate provision for the care of the sick. One sad case among many is that of a young man who when taken sick received a single visit from the doctor and no further care or special attention. Becoming delirious, his ravings so alarmed his room-mate that he ran from the room, and the patient got up from his bed. After trying for the second time the doctor was at last secured and came only to find that the young man had already died before the eyes of his helpless mates.

Following the well known rule that the less desirable the work and the more disadvantageous the conditions under which it is done the lower the remuneration received, we are not surprised to learn that the wages of the London shop assistants are even lower than the proverbially low wages of the famous London dockers. From the other archaic forms still to be found in the organization of the industry we may expect to find wages settled entirely through individual bargaining between the employer and employe. So far indeed is this carried that no employe has any means of knowing what any of their co-workers are receiving, while of course the employer bargains with all the advantage which a complete knowledge of all such facts will give. London being the Mecca of the provincial worker and the center toward which the young people from all parts of Great Britain throng most of the shop workers are country born, Wales in particular being known as the "happy hunting grounds of the shop-keeper."

The new comers, although they may have had several years experience in smaller cities are treated as "green hands" and alluring descriptions of the value of "London training" are held out to them with the result that they are not only frequently induced to engage for a couple of years without wages but it is no unusual thing for their parents to pay from \$100.00 to \$150.00 a year for the "privilege" of receiving this training.

In other cases, where more favorable terms have been made, the assistant, after serving free for three months to secure "experience," will receive \$1.25 a week. In a high class West End shop men start at \$100.00 a year and then while "living in" are obliged to pay from \$50 to \$60 of this for extra food. Wages for women vary from \$50.00 to in a few cases \$175.00 a year. Even these wages are being constantly reduced by the system of fines which is everywhere in force. In one shop we find no less than seventy-five rules enforced, and in another ninety-eight, all punishable by fines, varying in amount from three pence to the discretion of the floor-walker. An instance of the working of these rules is that of a boy who was fined ten shillings for having a frying pan in the box under his bed.

It must not be thought from what has been said that no one in England is awake to the troubles of the shop-assistant or that no effort is being made to remedy these evils. Through the indefatigable efforts of Mr. J. McPherson, and his very able assistant, Miss Margaret Bonfield, a shop assistants' union of over 5,000 members has been organized and an active campaign for parliamentary action against the worst abuses carried on. They have already secured the enactment of a law compelling the employers to furnish seats for their employees and it is believed that the investigations that are instituted at the suggestion of the labor members of Parliament will result in various changes.

MAY WOOD SIMONS.

The Political Situation in Europe.

NOT since the Congress of the Social Democratic Party which took place in the summer of 1902, have the Socialists of Munich had an opportunity to hear an address by August Bebel, leader of the German Social Democracy; and consequently, although the meeting at which Bebel was to speak was called for eight o'clock, the great hall of the *Kindlkeller* was well filled at six, and at seven the crowd had become so dense that the doors were shut by the police. From five o'clock in the afternoon a steady stream of workmen had been pouring into the building; an hour later every seat on the floor was occupied. Late comers were either obliged to stand or to take a back place in the galleries. Shortly before eight Bebel appeared, a storm of applause bursting forth as he slowly made his way to the platform. August Bebel was 66 years old on the 22d of February; his hair and beard are white, but he is still Bebel the "ever-young." His step has lost none of its elasticity; he is as agile in his movements and gestures as a man of thirty years, and his voice retains all its extraordinary carrying qualities and power. Slightly below the middle size, spare in figure, and unassuming in dress, there is but little in Bebel's external appearance to suggest the political genius and orator: like our own Lincoln and Wendell Phillips, we must hear him speak to be disillusioned. He spoke as follows:

The world of the ruling classes is always fighting for peace; we are assured by all governments that peace must be maintained for peace is necessary to the labor of civilization, — peace is the most valuable possession of mankind. Yet in contradiction to this assurance, all the nations of the world are striving to outdo one another in the construction of the most elaborate and costly armaments that have ever been known to history.

If we ask the ruling powers how they manage to bring their assurances of peace into harmony with their preparations for war, we are told that in order to have peace it is first necessary to be armed to the teeth. But no nation trusts another, and no one takes the assurance that peace is desired seriously. The world of the ruling classes indeed requires peace; its dominant principle is on the one hand labor, and on the other hand profits from labor and the accumulation of capital. To-day, no country in Europe, if forced to depend upon its own resources, would be able to exist; and however much we Socialists are reproached for our international tendencies, the capitalistic world

is itself compelled more and more to realize the spirit of internationalism. Each nation must enter into relations with other countries for the mutual exchange of industrial, agricultural and natural products. For this reason we have every reason to believe that the most obvious duty of the ruling classes is to maintain peace. And yet, every moment some question or another arises and seems to threaten the entire civilized world with a sudden outburst of hostilities.

Hand in hand with the work of exchanging the products of one nation with those of another goes the endeavor to conquer new markets in all quarters of the globe;—an endeavor which has also made its appearance in Germany. But as a matter of fact, everything in the shape of colonial territory that is worth the trouble of annexing has long been annexed. Like the poet in the fable, when it came to dividing up Germany arrived too late. From my present standpoint, there was no harm in that; for we exchange our products with civilized nations, not with Hottentots and Zulus. In 1905, Germany's foreign trade mounted up to the fabulous totals of thirteen thousand million marks (three billion dollars), and now I ask, what are the countries with which we have commercial relations? During the last few months there has been a great deal of discussion in regard to our relations with England, and not a few of our fellow countrymen suffer under the delusion that our first and foremost duty is to strain every effort to drag England down from the position which she holds to-day, and above all to make an attempt to seize for Germany one or more of the English colonies; for it is said in confidence that the colonies now owned by Germany are not fit to grow cabbage on. Yet twenty-four per cent of the foreign trade of Germany is with England, and in spite of all differences of opinion between the two countries, it increases from year to year, — an unanswerable proof that the material interests of nations are more powerful than personal likes or dislikes. Our trade with the United States amounts to some fifteen or sixteen hundred million marks (\$375,000,000). From America we obtain for the most part raw materials and foodstuffs that are absolutely indispensable to our welfare; for at home we are unable to raise and produce all that is necessary to supply our needs. Besides England and America, we have commercial relations with Russia, Austria, France, — in short, we can prove statistically that by far the greater part of our foreign trade is with the leading civilized nations of the world.

From this point of view, and considering their mutual necessities of life, it is madness for civilized nations to wish to measure their strength with one another in the battle-field, instead of by way of peaceful competition. And yet those questions are con-

stantly arising, as a result of which the world is confronted with the danger that some day the very thing that is dreaded most by all may happen, and a general conflagration burst forth between the leading powers. Such a question, which made a sudden appearance about two years ago, was

THE MOROCCO DISPUTE.

Morocco, a barbarian Mohammedan state in North Africa, is a country of extensive area and large population, two-thirds of whom, however, do not acknowledge their own Sultan, let alone any foreign ruler. It is a backward country, — backward in industry no less than in civilization, — although beyond doubt it possesses many possibilities of development. Since it is situated so close to France and Spain, it is not to be wondered at that these countries were anxious to establish themselves there. England also was greatly interested in Morocco, and at one time it almost appeared as if there was going to be war between England and France for supremacy in that country. But to everybody's surprise an agreement was entered into by France and England, April 8, 1904, according to which, in spite of their strongly opposed interests, France agreed to recognize England's position in Egypt and the Sudan, and England agreed to give France free hand in Morocco. There was a clause in the treaty which to a certain extent injured German interests, but, strange to say, Prince von Bülow declared at that time in the Reichstag, that Germany had no cause to be dissatisfied: for even if France did take charge of the affairs of Morocco, German industrialists were perfectly free to compete there if they chose. We may say in passing that German trade with Morocco amounts to about four million marks (less than \$1,000,000) a year, — a mere bagatelle compared to the 13,000 million marks of German international trade.

But the situation soon changed. It now appeared that what Prince von Bülow had praised as an acquisition, was after all of doubtful advantage. And as a matter of fact, the treaty contained a clause, according to which Germany was given the right to trade in Morocco for a period of thirty years only. We too thought that there was something wrong in this, but were of the opinion that the danger to which the nation would be exposed by a hostile interference in the affairs of Morocco was wholly out of proportion to the value of the object to be gained. However, the Morocco affair soon became a question of this nature. In a French document the suspicion is voiced that an attempt was made to convince the German Emperor that in consequence of the unfortunate outcome of the war with Japan, Russia would no longer take the part of France. And it is quite possible that

this suspicion was founded on fact; for a short time afterwards an event took place such as had never before happened in the intercourse between nations, — at least for the sake of a matter of such small importance. The German Emperor sailed to Tangier and talked to the representatives of the Sultan of Morocco in such a manner as could only heighten their feeling of self-importance and at the same time arouse a most unpleasant impression in France and England. It was not until the occurrence of this event that Prince von Bülow began to talk about an impending catastrophe; and Delcassé, the French Minister of foreign affairs, is said to have inquired of the British government if it would be willing to support France in case of a war with Germany.

It is a long time since England and Germany have been on friendly terms. A whole series of events, among others the celebrated telegram to President Paul Krüger, has tended to estrange Germany and England more and more from one another. The result of the Morocco question has been to cause England and France to become permanent friends, — to the injury of Germany. As was only to be expected, Italy and Russia also took the part of France, so that finally Germany was able to reap no other advantage than the abolition of the clause limiting her right of freedom of trade in Morocco to thirty years. All the rest is only of value to France and Spain. And it is for this reason that Prince von Bülow now tries to minimize as much as possible the significance of the Morocco question, — the same von Bülow who last summer is said to have inquired of the General Staff if it were prepared to begin the war! But this most recent declaration of von Bülow's stands in decided contradiction to the tendency of German foreign policy of recent years; and I fear that it has not had the effect of increasing the prestige of Germany and her diplomacy. We must also remember that during the entire tremendous

REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE IN RUSSIA,

Germany has done everything in her power *to be of service to the reaction*. (Cries of shame!) Germany has even gone so far as to anticipate every wish of the Russian government, besides agreeing to allow a Russian loan to be raised here; and as a reward Russia has just opposed the German claims in Algieras in a most ostentatious and insolent manner. A more humiliating situation is scarcely to be imagined; but the Russian government knows only too well that Germany is at its beck and call. The heart of our ruling classes, especially the East Prussian agrarian nobility, is with the Russian government. The East Prussian nobility looks upon the Russian autocracy as its ideal, and expects,

in case a serious struggle should burst forth in Germany between the government and the people, that if the former should prove too weak to withstand the will of the latter, that Russia would assist it with her Cossacks.

The Prussian nobility is the incarnation of all reaction, the representative of whatever is opposed to the welfare of the people, the enemy of all economic progress. So long as Russia remains a despotism, it is her endeavor to uphold similar political conditions in all adjacent countries. But the war with Japan and the revolution at home have now combined to weaken Russian absolutism, and the ruling classes in Germany, the Emperor, von Bülow, and the East Prussian nobility view with regret the events that are taking place in Russia, and would welcome the day they could see the old conditions restored,—that is, if the old conditions were capable of being restored! But that is a thing of the past. The Russian revolution will not come to an end until the autocracy has been succeeded by a more reasonable social order.

For us, the *general situation* is not very edifying. We have not one friend left except Austria; but Austria has fallen far behind the times in financial affairs, and in military entanglements financial power is a very important matter. Still, from this point of view, poverty has its advantages. The development of military strength has grown to a colossal extent. In 1900 a conference was held at The Hague to discuss the question of disarmament, and now Russia comes along with

A SECOND PEACE CONFERENCE

—more banqueting and pacific resolutions—and armaments to be increased on sea and land. (Laughter.) There is much reason for laughter; the pacific resolutions will remain written in black and white for the entertainment of future generations no less than of the present. For ten years the idea has been officially promulgated, that Germany also must live up to her interests as a World Power, and we have been told that whenever opportunity offered our national importance was to be clinched by a demonstration. And so we tried to demonstrate in Morocco,—only it did not all turn out quite as was expected. In 1896, the majority in the Reichstag, including even the Conservatives, declared that we had no inclination to compete with other nations in costly armaments, if for no other reason than because the necessary funds were lacking. But since that time, one after another the bourgeois parties have capitulated; and a few weeks ago the naval programme was voted for by all except the Social Democrats. For eight years Germany has endeavored to become at least a second-rate sea-power. In 1905, we expended the enorm-

ous sum of twelve thousand fifty-eight million marks on the army and navy; and all the while the national debt has been constantly increasing. Such management as this is enough to bring on a catastrophe even in times of peace. The committee on taxes is searching everywhere for new sources of revenue. And the Clericals are now discussing the expediency of a so-called military tax, in case the present objects of taxation prove insufficient. This is the same Clerical party that in 1900 introduced a paragraph into the naval bill, stipulating that if the naval budget should exceed one hundred and seventeen millions, the surplus should not be raised through indirect taxation.

The new proposals for additional revenue are

INDIRECT TAXES

which must be borne by the masses of the people. The taxes that ought to be levied, namely, on incomes, property and inheritances are conspicuous by their absence. During the recent debate on the naval budget, the property tax suggested by the *Freisinnige Volkspartei*, which would have yielded forty millions, was rejected, — likewise the tax on all incomes of over five thousand marks by the Social Democratic group. We want those people to pay who claim that patriotism demands that Germany should require a huge army and navy. We want them to be patriotic not in word but in action. The State is at bottom a great mutual insurance company, and the premiums should be paid in proportion to the services rendered. Since the army is an organization for the defense of the interests of the propertied classes, — it is also employed in the struggle against the “enemy at home”, — and since the navy serves a similar purpose, justice demands that both should be paid for by the classes who seek their protection.

But *direct taxes on property and incomes* are paid by no ruling class, with the exception of the English bourgeoisie. At the time of the struggle in South Africa with its tremendous drain on the finances of England, the English middle class, (and in Germany this must be said to their credit by a Social Democrat) increased the tax on incomes in order to meet the extraordinary expenses of the war, — and in England incomes of less than three thousand marks (\$700) a year are free from taxation. In this way the English bourgeoisie were enabled to raise no less than one thousand one hundred millions in direct taxes. It is true that at the same time a duty on grain was also adopted; but whereas we paid here at that time a duty of three and a half marks per double hundredweight, the English duty was only one-seventh of that amount. Moreover, although the English duty on grain was abolished at the end of two years, our duty has been increased to five and a half marks, or almost sixty per cent. This is the work of the agrarian nobility. Thus while in a nation also

ruled by the bourgeoisie, not only the principle of *noblesse oblige* prevails, but also the principle that the possession of property brings with it responsibility to the public; in our country, the society for the promotion of the interests of the navy, which recruits the majority of its members from the most fashionable circles, had the unparalleled impudence to demand that the entire surplus of the duty on grain, which had been set aside for a pension fund for widows and orphans (30-40 million marks), should be devoted to the building of new warships! I cannot conceive of anything more infamous than that such a desire should be expressed by the wealthy classes of a nation.

Thus armaments have everywhere taken a new lease of life. It is an interesting question how things would turn out

IF WAR WERE REALLY DECLARED.

All the nations of Europe are in debt, and their indebtedness is increasing from year to year. What is yielded by taxation just suffices to make both ends meet in time of peace. But how would this be in case of a war? Germany would now place five million men in the field as compared to the one and a half million of 1870. Mobilization alone would cost 700 million marks, of which only the 120 million deposited in the *Juliusturm* are available. The expenses of the first month have been estimated at 1,400 million marks, and if we were obliged to carry on the war for a year, the cost would be 22,000 million marks. Where is the money to come from? The wealthy classes will not furnish it, and the issue of paper money would immediately be followed by its depreciation. Even granted that we were victorious, does anyone believe that there is a nation to be found capable of paying an adequate indemnity, as was the case in 1870-71? We would have to enslave the inhabitants of entire France in order to clear off the debt. It is also possible that the pension funds would be used for the same purpose. We have been in the habit of granting pensions to the disabled, but considering the increased effectiveness of modern weapons there would now be an appalling number of wounded, and where are the funds to be obtained? We must also remember that of the 5 million troops $3\frac{1}{2}$ million individuals would at once cease all productive work. In a war of the future we would have both France and England against us: they would blockade the North sea and the Baltic; trade, both import and export, would stagnate; the millions of workers who remained in the factories would be thrown out of employment; and as a result of the interruption in the importation of the necessities of life, there would be a sudden rise in prices. How would the capitalistic world be able to face such a situation? It is probable that it would be at the end of its tether.

Two years ago in the Reichstag, when I similarly described the probable effects of a European war, and in my reply to Prince-von Bülow declared that such a situation would signify that the last hour of the capitalistic order had come, Von Bülow answered: "This we know, and because we know it we will avoid war." But if that is the case, why these endless preparations for war? We also have a

COLONIAL POLICY,

and our colonies are a heavy expense. If we had to pay for our foreign trade a tithe of what we pay for our colonial trade, we would go bankrupt in one year. We are told that the navy is for the protection of our colonies; but in case of a war we could not even protect our commerce. Our sea coast requires no fleets for its defense; but our trading vessels could be captured and our commerce destroyed. With our navy shut up in the harbors, England could, if she chose, take possession of every one of our colonies.

We Social Democrats are considered enemies of our native country. I have just shown how profound the love of the Jingo patriots is for their native country, so long as it does not cost them anything. When it comes to paying, their patriotism evaporates. They increase both navy and army, and thereby create new sinecures to be occupied by the sons of the nobility and bourgeoisie. The masses pay, and in time of war *their* sons are the food for powder. The nobility and bourgeoisie are also enthusiastic for colonial expansion, for officials are needed there too. We stand for

THE INTERNATIONAL INTERESTS OF CIVILIZATION.

We are not of the opinion that there will be a general dissolution of civilized nations; but we are opposed to the unheard-of burdens that are laid upon the shoulders of the workers of every nation to pay for the creation of instruments of destruction. We wish to employ this wealth for the furtherance of civilization. We believe that the common interests of nations are growing from year to year, in spite of the endeavors of the ruling classes to erect barriers of protective duties between them. Just as we have a national house of representatives, so should civilized nations have an international parliament for the arbitration of disputes. If we are told that this is idealism, our reply is that all that exists to-day was once idealism. Christianity also is international, and tells us of a God who allows the sun to shine on both the just and the unjust. But these same Christians, when it comes to a conflict between nations, see nothing strange in appealing to an international God for the victory of their own

particular nation. We know very well that nothing can be accomplished by preaching: if we desire the internationalism of peoples, we must recognize and strengthen the internationalism of interests. The International Postal Union,—in fact, every commercial treaty is a work of international solidarity. Why can not this spirit of solidarity between nations be infused into all our relations? Where there's a will there's a way. The working-class of the various civilized nations, who are everywhere subjected to exploitation and oppression, have but one interest, not only within their own nations, but also in the relations of the different nations to one another. From this the

INTERNATIONALISM OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT

has naturally developed. When the danger of war between Germany and France arose last year, it was the Social Democrats of Germany and France who stood together as one man for the idea of peace.

But it is not only the burden of armaments by which the people are oppressed. On the first of March of this year, the new tariff laws came into force, and the result of these tariff laws has been a general rise in the price of the necessities of life. What one could buy for 100 marks three years ago now costs 120 marks. But in the meantime the income of the workers has not increased; and in this manner must the working class pay the penalty of the military expenses of the nation with poor nutrition, sickness and death. A decade ago there were millions of people in Germany who were insufficiently nourished, and what must their condition be to-day? Even our Jingo patriots will have the effects of the increased cost of living brought home to them, for the number of unfit recruits for the army must increase with insufficient nourishment. A further effect of the new tariff laws is the decrease of our exports, due to tariff wars with other nations.

That our domestic political relations are also in a lamentable condition can be gathered *ad nauseam* from the newspapers. On the 20th of January, 1903, Prince von Bülow announced in the Reichstag the social program of the Emperor and the State Governments. The Imperial Chancellor said that the workers should be granted equal rights with the other classes, and that this equality of rights should find its expression in legislation. The German workingman is still waiting in vain for the Chancellor's words to be realized. A short time ago at a banquet given by the agrarian party, Prince von Bülow spoke of Social Democracy among other things, and said that the Social Democrats are endeavoring to ruin the farmers. But that is precisely what we are not trying to do; *what we want is truth and justice in all human relations in state and society*. No one shall be permitted to live at the cost of another, or to exploit and oppress his fellow

man. We wish to assist the farmer with all our power in his endeavor to obtain better means of conveyance, agricultural schools and colleges, experiment stations, instruction in scientific methods of stock breeding and sanitation; but we are not willing that the prosperity of the peasants should be paid for by the increased cost of living of the proletariat. I have never heard of a peasant starving to death, but starving workingmen are to be numbered by thousands. What has become of von Bülow's social reforms and equality of rights? Perhaps the continuance of the three-class system of voting is the answer to this question, or the attempted suppression of the right of coalition and of holding political meetings, or class justice! And in view of these conditions, can one wonder that in reply to a question list published in a French newspaper, some of the most distinguished men of Europe have stated that in the interest of freedom and progress they should not care to see the influence of Germany increase? But we will take care that what is said of the Germany of to-day will not be true of the Germany of the future. We Social Democrats demand the freedom of all men; and in order that this demand may be realized, we require knowledge of national and social conditions, unity of action, and the enlightenment of all classes, above all the working class. The workers must learn to know their historical mission; they have no other future except Socialism. And hence I say to you: your future depends upon your own unaided efforts; join hands with the party of the proletariat, support our organization and our press, and then in closed ranks forward to victory!

AUGUST BEBEL.

(The above address delivered at Munich, April 7th, 1906, was furnished us through the kindness of *Wilshire's Magazine*, by whose foreign correspondent the report was sent.)

The Election in Denmark.

NEVER has the Danish Social Democracy won a prouder victory than at the election for the *Folkething* (the second legislative chamber) on the 29th of May. Their vote, which in 1903 was about 55,000 rose to 76,566, an increase of 25 per cent over the previous vote. The number of members elected rose from 16 to 24 (out of a total of 114.) To be sure one previously Socialist district was lost; but in place of this nine new ones were captured. What was even more significant than the momentary gain, was the promise for the future of our party contained in the result of the election. In a long list of districts our minorities were so large that their capture at the next election is certain; in three districts, for example, we were defeated by less than one hundred votes; in four others we lacked between 100 and 200. On the next occasion, which cannot be later than 1909, and probably will be next year, when we enter into the electoral battle, the number of Social Democratic seats cannot be less than thirty. Even in many districts where the majority of our opponents was much larger, we have made such great gains, that even there we can hope for victory within a perceptible number of years. A complete picture of the growth which our party has made can be best comprehended by a study of the forty-five districts in which we participated at the last election, which gives an opportunity for comparisons of strength. The increase in these was 35 per cent, from 43,741 votes in 1903 to 59,066 in 1906. It is this steady irresistible advance, this so-to-speak cosmical growth of socialism in all portions of the country, that has been so strikingly characteristic of the last three years. To mention one typical example of this ripening process in a single Danish electoral district: in Fredrica, in southern Jutland, a Social Democrat, (a printer by the name of Rasmussen) was nominated for the first time in 1892; he received only 59 votes; in 1895 his vote had grown to 167; in 1898 to 385; in 1901 to 901; in 1903 to 1088, and in recent election he was victorious with a vote of 1446.

The character of the victories are perhaps even more significant than their number. The previous socialist districts were, without exception, city districts—ten of them were in Copenhagen and the immediate suburbs, and the six additional, in other great cities. Of the nine newly acquired districts, on the contrary, only three can be designated as city districts; in four the urban population makes up but 35 per cent of the total population, in one about 20 per cent, and the other is purely rural. The same

thing is true of those districts where we are just crossing the threshold to victory; the overwhelming majority are populated mainly or exclusively by an agricultural population. This means that the Social Democracy is now pushing its victorious course out into the open country. Agricultural laborers and small farmers are being rapidly awakened to socialist consciousness. There has always been some grounds hitherto for the assertions of our opponents that socialism could take root only in the paving stones of the great cities, but this saying has now lost all meaning. With a greater clearness than ever before the Social Democracy has announced itself as the party of the proletariat, in the country as well as in the city. This fact may indeed be looked upon with greater cause for rejoicing than any other.

In the political situation of the immediate present, these facts are of very great importance.

There exists at the present moment in Danish politics something that can only be designated as a conspiracy of the possessing classes against the propertiless. Landlords, capitalists, and great farmers are combined against the laborers and the small farmers. Since the year 1901 when the Agrarian fraction of the Left came into power,* their democratic tendencies quickly and thoroughly faded away. Of the social reforms concerning which during the long opposition period so much was said, only a very few and very insignificant ones were realized; while on the other hand whatever furthered the Agrarian and capitalist interest at the cost of the poorer portion of the population, found fertile soil. Consequently there arose in all spheres of public life a hostility to culture (*Kulturfeindschaft*) such a darkness, and appeal to the worst instincts; the "whipping law" of the last session, providing for the re-introduction of corporal punishment in certain criminal cases shows the intellectual level. There were two questions which were especially prominent during the recent campaign: the radical reduction of military expenses, and the extension of universal and equal suffrage in municipal elections. On both of these points, the very touch-stones of democracy, the betrayal was plain. The military question was temporarily buried in a commission, but it was very plain both from the expressions of the leading men of the Left, as well as from many individual measures, that we might rather expect an increase than a diminution of military expenses from the Left. And so far as the promised suffrage is concerned, we are now confronted with the proposal not only to exclude married women and servants, but to introduce the proportional system and to require a majority of three-fourths or four-fifths of the members of the municipal councils, which would place the possessing class in a

*) See INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, Vol II, p. 29.

position to prevent any reform in the interest of the propertiless class. It was particularly the great farmers who sought thus to guard their money bags, and who were met more than half way in the task by the capitalists and landlords.

The center of gravity of Danish politics has been forced into the *Landsting* (the first legislative chamber.) Here the capitalists, and especially the great land owners, by virtue of a privileged suffrage, have a majority, and here the fate of all proposed laws is decided; every reform that does not further the interests of the rich soon has its throat cut, and the ministry looks on quite contented. Instead of taking up an aggressive policy against the *Landsting*, for which it possesses the legal power to nominate new members, it seeks only to form compromises with the country nobility (*Junkerregiment*.) In this way it proves false to all its democratic traditions.

The political conditions through which we are now passing resemble those of a generation ago when the Conservative landlords and the National-Liberal capitalists, amalgamated in the party of the Right. At that time the motive which forced them to act was fear of a class movement among the peasants. Now when the landlords, capitalists and the large and medium sized farmers are preparing to unite in a "conservative combination"—into an anti-socialist mass—the motive is the common fear of the powerful, rising class movement of the proletariat.

When at last the betrayal of democratic principles became plainly evident, at the beginning of the year 1905, a group broke away from the Left and formed a new "Radical Party," with a platform resting on universal suffrage, and demanding a long list of social reforms, the larger portion of which were taken from the Social Democratic list of immediate demands. These Radicals fought hand in hand with the Social Democratic Party at the polls against the reactionary parties, but with little results. Although in many districts where the Social Democratic movement was still poorly developed, we supported their candidates, nevertheless the number of their representatives fell from 15 to 9, and many of those that they now possess are held by a narrow margin. The time when a really radical capitalist democracy is possible seems certainly to have passed away. Divided up, as individuals, the radical writers, artists, teachers, etc., can still perform a service in the fight against the ignorance and vileness of the reaction. But the great mass of the people, so often and so deeply disappointed in their hopes of the capitalist parties, are now going directly into the ranks of the Social Democracy.

GUSTAV BANG.

Translated from the German by A. M. Simons.

The Relation of Individualism to Socialism.

Reply to Bryan.

IT WILL be necessary to correct two of Mr. Bryan's definitions and some of the interpretations of socialism in his article on "Individualism versus Socialism" in the April *Century Magazine*. But at the same time it is admitted with chagrin that the socialist philosophy has been thus misunderstood and misinterpreted by some who are regarded as authorities. Where then shall we find an authoritative definition of what socialism means? In the United States alone some tens of thousands of voting men are united in a dues paying organization for a definite aim which they call socialism. Delegates duly authorized by them, elected to a national convention, have set forth a definition of purpose upon which these men agree and for which they are organized. This document is the National Platform of the Socialist Party of the United States. It is our expression of the same purpose declared with equal authority in the platforms of the party in other nations. This does not imply that these millions of socialists do not hold opposite opinions on other subjects and even on problems concerning socialism not definitely dealt with in our platform. But on so much we are agreed, because this document has the almost unqualified approval of the party members through a referendum vote of the party upon each clause of it. No individual or committee can presume to state for us in obvious opposition to this platform what our united purpose is, though they may interpret its meaning with as much weight as their influence can give. More than this document conveys the party does not assume responsibility for. Let those who approve it answer for it as a personal opinion; but, by so much as they have overstepped in assuming more authority for it, they have misrepresented us. Our platform contains the declaration of a simple purpose:

"Socialism means that all those things upon which the people in common depend shall by the people in common be owned and administered; it means that the tools of employment shall belong to their creators and users; that all production shall be for the direct use of the producers; that the making of goods for profit shall come to an end; that we shall all be workers together, and that all opportunities shall be open and equal to all men."

Preliminary to the accomplishment of this revolutionary

aim, there are some things we would do merely as steps to its accomplishment and as measures of relief for the present, which are set forth in the concluding paragraphs; and the preceding part is an indictment of capitalism. But the foregoing paragraph is the socialist platform in the sense that it is a bare definition of purpose.

We will not be drawn into an attitude of attack upon individualism because Mr. Bryan defends capitalism under the name individualism. Accepting his assumption that the highest aim of society is the harmonious development of the human race, physically, mentally, and morally, it is the purpose of this endeavor to show that the socialist program is indispensable to it. Socialism must be in order that we may have political and religious liberty, freedom of speech, individual liberty, and private property, in other words, individualism. The dictionaries say that individualism means "the quality of being separate or individual, having individuality. Personal independence of action, character, or interest. *The theory of government that favors the utmost social and economic liberty of the individual.*" This definition taken from the Standard Dictionary, — and other authorities give pretty much the same thing — is quite good enough for the purposes of this discussion. Mr. Bryan gives a definition he likes better. "For the purpose of this discussion," he says, "individualism will be defined as the private ownership of the means of production and distribution where competition is possible, leaving to public ownership those means of production and distribution in which competition is practically impossible; and socialism will be defined as the collective ownership, through the state, of all the means of production and distribution." Now this is better as a definition of capitalism than it is as a definition of individualism. For even where competition is possible, private ownership of the means of production and distribution necessarily involves that the tools will be owned for the most part by those who don't use them, and used by those who don't own them. Of course this is true not only for the most part but altogether without exception of means of production and distribution in which competition is impossible. Private ownership therefore involves capitalism. The aim of the socialist is "that the tools of employment shall belong to their creators and users." No one else could have any purpose in owning them but to get an income from the labor of those who use them. And this is the essential purpose of capitalism, to get profit, interest, and rent without labor, which it is the essential purpose of socialism to defeat. The capitalists' purpose is accomplished with systematic perfection in the modern stock corporation. If the corporation owns means of production in which competition is practically impossible, it is called a trust, and gets its profits

by two different ways. The first, by extortionate charges drawn from the purchasing public, is condemned by Mr. Bryan. The extortionate prices are paid out of the profits of the middle class capitalist. He does not particularly condemn the other way, by the exploitation of propertiless laborers. The middle class capitalist also gets his profits in this way.

Whether "socialists agree in hostility to competition" and "regard competition as a hurtful force to be entirely exterminated" depends upon just what is meant by competition. The man on the street believes that socialism would abolish competition. He has been told so by socialists and by the opponents of socialism. He is being told so yet. But neither socialism nor anything else can abolish competition among men for a better reward to be gotten by excelling one another in usefulness to their fellow men. Competition in this sense is necessary to the well being of society and works harm to no one. It may be said with absolute positiveness that this is not the competition that socialists would have abolished. Mr. Bryan divides our industries into those in which competition is practically impossible and those in which competition is yet possible. Let us compare the advantages of organized industry urged by the socialists, even as the trusts have established it, with the results of competition. In the trust organization we have orderly co-operation, efficiency, and, for the masters' profit, economy of everything but the lives of the employees. In competition we have numberless little inefficient factories and stores fighting one another in the dark to get the business; consequently, there is working at cross purposes, waste, improvidence, and ruin. In fact it is anarchy, compared with order, though it be the orderly co-operation of slaves. Individualism does not involve anarchy. But, if this competition be necessary to it, it does. This is the competition which the socialists said must go. And it is surely going. Even Mr. Bryan has ceased talking about making "laws against corporations existing in restraint of trade" and he admits now that there are industries in which competition has become practically impossible. Nor is there reason to take it for granted that the tremendous advantages of organized co-operative industry cannot be enjoyed without the overwhelming disadvantage of stifling individual initiative and independence.

The desire to be independent, to work out one's individual success unhampered by the stupid or domineering interference of others, is just as natural to the socialist as to those who affect the name individualists. But the socialist sees that the individual ownership of means of production and distribution not individually used gives the owners power to hold others in dependence and even slavery. Control of our occupations is involved in the ownership of our tools. And in control of our

occupations all the important affairs of our lives are involved. The propertiless wage worker has nothing in this world but his power to labor. And even this is worthless if he cannot apply it to the means of production. Therefore he has no rights he can defend. Certainly he has no rights our masters will always respect. This private ownership therefore is not individualism, though Mr. Bryan calls it so. The social system founded on private ownership of the machinery of production is plainly in opposition to "the theory of government that favors the utmost social and economic liberty of the individual." These reasons have been presented with the utmost clearness again and again to the trading class without apparent effect upon their fine sensibilities.

But recently the middle class capitalist has come under an influence whose gentle persuasiveness quickly illuminates his mind. Collective ownership through the government of machinery of production does not now seem to him so idiotic. For he perceives that the private ownership of machinery of production and distribution, as for instance a railroad, in which competition is practically impossible, gives the owners power to confiscate his factory or mine which must use it, just as his private ownership of machinery of collective production in which competition is still possible enables him to take profit from the wage workers who must use it. If the trust is not a logical economic development consistent with middle class business methods, why is it that the Democratic Party of the middle class, like the Republican Party of the great capitalists, never applied any legislation while in power, and never proposed any legislation in or out of power which can be effective against the trusts? They would make laws, but what laws? There is not in this country a complete monopoly. No law can be devised against the big establishment controlling sixty or eighty per cent. of the business which does not apply just as well to the little capitalist. Therefore the Democratic Party seeks now to develop some strength by advocating in appearance a thing which socialists have advocated long before, but after adapting it to middle class interests.

But we do not concede, as Mr. Bryan does, that competition can be carried to a point where it would create a submerged tenth. Competition is not to be charged with the presence of this surplus unemployed or miserably employed population which degenerates necessarily into a submerged tenth. It is directly the result of private ownership of means of production in which competition is possible, as well as of means of production in which competition is practically impossible. Under private ownership of the means of social production every increase in the aggregate productive power of the workers increases their

poverty, slavery, and despair. For private ownership of the tools as they are to-day, developed into machines and systems of machines in factories, involves, even where there is competition, the operation of the industry for the profit of the owners. Suppose the introduction of machinery that multiplies the product of a given amount of labor eight times. In "The Trust, Its Book," it is said that machinery has multiplied the aggregate product of labor eight times. And there are machines that have multiplied their product a hundred or five hundred or even four thousand times. If no more of the product is sold, then only one eighth of the labor can continue to be employed in its production. If the same labor as before is to continue in this employment, eight times as much must be sold. Who is to buy this vastly increased quantity of products? Those who made them cannot buy them. Business is conducted to pay them the smallest possible part of the price of their own products and the capitalists the highest possible profits. The capitalists have used it to support workers employed in building the new factories for the industries in which their profits have been invested. But their investments prove to be bad, for they cannot sell the still greater quantities of products which the new plants turn out. And the capitalists say to themselves, "To what purpose would we invest our money to employ people in building more factories to make more of the same products which we already cannot sell?" Under the profit system the sale of the products cannot increase equally with the tremendous increase in the quantity produced with the same labor. Continued employment depends upon the sale of the product at a profit, which is ultimately impossible. Private ownership of the improved machinery of production, therefore, makes employment for an increasing number of the workers impossible. Nor is this effect confined to the reserve army of unemployed, which is continually changing but never disappears. The intense competition of these unemployed anxiously seeking the jobs that all cannot have reduces all workers to an average wage of bare living.

These are the commonplace conditions under which the so-called free contract is made between the wage worker and the private owners of the machinery of production. These are the conditions under which the propertiless man, hat in hand, with probably one week's wage between him and actual want, faces the flint-hearted factory superintendent, who holds his position by reason of his proved ability to hire labor cheap, and to get the most work out of his hands. This is inevitably the result of private ownership of the tools used collectively. But Mr. Bryan disclaims responsibility for this logically inevitable consequence of private ownership by saying: "It is not only con-

sistent with individualism but a necessary implication of it that the competing parties should be placed upon substantially equal footing, for competition is not worthy of that name if one party is able to arbitrarily fix the terms of the agreement leaving the other with no choice but to submit to the terms prescribed. . . . When the money lender is left free to take advantage of the necessities of the borrower, the so-called freedom of contract is freedom to extort." This is doubtless a sincere expression of trading class morality. But notwithstanding their fine sentiments in favor of a full and free competition, made fair by law, these individualists have usually taken the utmost advantage of the wage worker which their ownership of the tools made possible.

The capitalist is not contending merely for the return of the value of his efforts, of which the benefits have been enjoyed by others. For, if he gets back only so much as he puts in, what would be the purpose of his investment. If all the value of his property and of the use of it, and all the value of his own labor is paid to him and no more, what would his profit be? This profit is something he demands beside and above and in addition to all the value he contributes to society by his labor and through the use of his property. For, if his labor is sold for no more than the like labor of others, and his property for only so much as it is worth, he would receive only his own, and what would be the reward of his business sagacity? His code of ethics is devised accordingly. The ethics of the capitalist class does not restrain them from buying cheap and selling for more without labor to add to the value of the commodity dealt in. Since only nothing can out of nothing come, where does their profit come from? If no labor is done to add to the value of the commodity, and no change occurs in the cost of production, when it is sold for more, either he to whom it is sold, or he from whom it was bought must be cheated. One cannot get a dollar honestly without working for it, except by gift. Besides this way of taking advantage of ignorance or misfortune by buying property for less than value and selling it for more than its value, there is the eminently respectable and orthodox method of capitalist accumulation by hiring labor at the price of its necessities. The benevolent capitalist, owning the tools and materials for production, perceives the poverty and anxiety of his propertiless fellow man, and estimates how far he can take advantage of it to his own profit. If the supply of labor is great and the demand small, the worthy man expects to hire labor cheap, even if the product of the labor sells for a very good price. For that is his good fortune, or rather the result of his business sagacity. By either or both of these methods, business, to be successful, must be done. They fairly illustrate the moral-

ity and the system of ethics which Mr. Bryan offers to measure against the ethics and morality of socialism. This system of ethics, by courtesy, so-called, draws a distinction where there is not a difference in moral and material effects between robbery by one means of imposition and robbery by another.

Our opponents are better able to discuss the subject of socialism the less they know about it. This is the most charitable construction that can be put upon the persistency with which our aim is represented to be an arbitrarily imposed social equality stifling individual initiative and independence, a religious and sentimental communism in which it is hoped to "substitute altruistic for selfish motives." No, socialists do not hope to attain a nearer approach to justice by purging the individual of selfishness. We reckon on human selfishness mostly for our chances of success, taking man to be just what he is. But though the success of socialism does not depend on it, we do anticipate that when the penalties are removed from honesty and fair dealing and the highest rewards are no longer to be gained by unscrupulous business, more people will determine to be honest. For nothing so thoroughly unfits a man for the pursuit of great business success as scrupulous honesty. Socialism is no altruistic scheme but the demand of accurate justice and stern necessity which must now command the serious consideration of men and women who expect to pay for what they get and intend to get what they pay for.

At least it can be said that the workers of the world have nothing to lose in the apportionment of rewards, which cannot be made worse for them than it is. Society has nothing they do not contribute by their labor applied to the natural resources. Its fine fictions about justice consist mostly in defining the ways in which the fruits of labor may be gotten without labor. There must indeed be all the different kinds of employments, some tasks more uncomfortable, unhealthy and dangerous, and again some tasks which will require more of the ability and intellect developed by long previous preparation, either inherited or attained in a single life. And the prevalent notion of socialism has been that all these various kinds of activity are to be rewarded according to arbitrary decisions of some executive committee, or that they should all be paid the same. How great was the blunder of such an admission when seriously made by a socialist may be judged by the eagerness and activity with which our opponents disseminate and strengthen the absurd popular notion that this is the aim of the Socialist Party. All the methods and resources for attacking this problem of determining the pay justly for different kinds of work which exist now will be available under the democratic administration of industries. There is nowhere any official declaration of the Socialist

Party which suggests or implies any change from the commonplace way in which the relative pay for different kinds of work is determined now, that is, determines itself by the ordinary action of supply and demand. Indeed nothing is said about it in socialist platforms, and nothing needs to be said. There will be all the various incentives to excell which exist now, including the desire for material gain. In as much as the material gain will be many times greater than what can be gotten by merely honest and useful activity now, perhaps we are right in thinking that the incentive to get it will not be any less. This accords with the conclusions of writers on scientific socialism, whose works are regarded as classics. Mr. Charles H. Kerr, who has translated and published more standard works on modern socialism probably than any other man in America, writes in his late brief article on The Co-operative Commonwealth as follows: "When the co-operative commonwealth is in operation, wages will tend to adjust themselves. If enough street cleaners cannot be had for fifty cents an hour, we shall have to pay sixty. If there are too many book-keepers at fifty cents, the pay may drop to forty until part of them have found work that is more in demand." This was issued with the formal approval of our National Committee, and hundreds of thousands of copies of it have been distributed by the state committees of the Socialist Party. A more direct and unmistakable declaration of the position taken by the Socialist Party on this question could not be had. And from whence it comes it carries the authority of the National Committee of the party and of the state committees also.

If there had been no development of improved machinery, that is, if the people who use the tools could now own them individually, there would be no demand for collective ownership of them. We can work with this machinery only collectively, not individually; therefore, if this social tool is to be owned by the people who use it, it can be owned by them only collectively. But this does not involve the ownership by the government of all the means of production. It does not imply that there would be no occupations outside of government control and therefore no outlet for discontent with government management. There need be and there should be no restrictions upon harmless private enterprises. In fact this common ownership of the things we depend upon in common alone can make possible what the individualist calls a fair field of free competition. In it the private enterprise threatened by the great capitalists or prohibited altogether by the extortions of the trusts would again find its opportunity. And the skillful and industrious workman and the able and efficient business manager could each increase his income by increasing his productive power. In the same article

Comrade Kerr writes on this subject: "It is very certain that a socialist administration would not control all industry from one central point. The Socialist Party always and everywhere leaves control in the hands of the smallest groups that can manage efficiently. Again, it would not take away the artist's brushes, nor the farmer's little farm. We hold that tools so complex that they have to be used in common should be owned in common; but, if a man choose to work with his own tools, there would be nothing in the world to prevent him from doing so, except the probable fact that as machinery improves it will be possible to earn more by working co-operatively than by working alone."

WARREN ATKINSON.

Why the Workingman Does Not Go to Church.

IN NEARLY every pulpit the country over this question is being asked. Solutions are many, diverse and even contradictory. But somehow the policies formulated to bring the workingman back to the fold are ineffectual, and the workingman appears to be contented to wend his weary way minus spiritual guidance from ordained ministers of the gospel.

Possibly due to the fact that our age is termed one of rampant individualism, the solutions to the problem have assumed a personal aspect for the most part. So we are told that it is because preachers do not make their sermons absorbingly interesting and because they do not come close enough to the toiler's everyday life, that the pews are empty and the collections meagre. And as a consequence we are treated to the spectacle of pastors endeavoring to keep their flock under their benign care by providing vaudeville entertainments, while festivals, lotteries and picnics are resorted to for the purpose of raising funds.

But, in the opinion of the writer, the problem is not a personal one. Or, rather, whatever personal equation may enter into the matter, the writer holds that underlying the wide-spread and universal apathy is a social cause, that is not even bounded by the limits of the country.

The workingman does not go to church because he is part of the modern labor movement. And the modern labor movement *as a movement* is and is bound to be irreligious.

This does not mean that the individuals constituting the labor movement are of necessity less God-fearing than heretofore. It does not mean that there is anything in the internal workings of the labor movement that cultivates skepticism or makes the individual's mind a fertile ground for the breeding of agnostic and atheistic doctrines. It does not mean that because of their affiliation with the labor movement, that Christians and Jews leave their old faiths for a new one. The personal beliefs or disbeliefs of the component parts do not go a little way toward determining the irreligious principles of the whole. It is because the labor movement as a movement has a decided program, because it is confronted with certain grim facts, and because its struggle for existence compels it to adapt itself to the conditions as they are and fight its battle with weapons that are not of its own choosing, that the labor movement is irreligious.

For the church — public worship, — as an institution, has to a large extent ever been in control of the ruling class. And

the movement of the ruled class has ever been irreligious, because the hand of the religious institution was raised against it. History will bear out this assertion.

Take for example the destruction of feudalism.. Feudalism was a social order, a phase in the development of society, remarkable for the fact that it tried to be stationary. There was no demand for culture, civilization or progress. The permanence of the feudalist system was dependant upon things remaining just as they were. This made it logical for an institution like the Catholic Church to be the power behind the throne, to declare the hereditary rulers divinely elected and to threaten with excommunication and death any thought of change in science or politics.

But the ovum of the present business system had nevertheless been impregnated with the discoveries and inventions of the fifteenth century, and all attempts to resist nature's course proved futile. And the food upon which the infant fed sapped the vitality of its mother. With the ascendancy of the bourgeoisie, every encouragement and impetus was given to the inventor, to the explorer, to the scientist and to the innovator. And because the Church was the right bower of the feudal regime, the movement of the rising class was irreligious. So came, indeed, the Reformation. And so the narrow materialism of Bacon, Hobbes and Locke. As feudalism lingered on, the attack on the Church grew more outspoken, until, with the overthrow of the system through the French Revolution, the fact was flaunted to the sky.

For its part, America has witnessed numerous changes in the course of its brief life — for events travel with seven league boots in modern history — and the movements of the under strata grasping for power have all been irreligious.

The American revolution — coming even before the sacrilegious French revolution — was an indication of the truth that it is social conditions and not individual thoughts and feelings that determine the actions of peoples, and that similar social conditions produce like consequences, irrespective of the temperament of the people. What with Jefferson, Franklin, Paine and "Brother Jonathan" and with such sentiments as "Put your trust in God, but keep your powder dry," it is a wonder that the Declaration of Independence even went so far as to acknowledge the existence of "nature's God." Certain it is, the Church as an institution denounced the rebels in no uncertain language, and it is no mere accident that Tom Paine grasped the first opportunity in his busy career to pen his "Age of Reason" — to demolish the old religious notions, — as a companion piece to his "Rights of Man" — to demolish old political notions.

Abolitionism also encountered the antagonism of the Church. For a time trial boards were kept pretty busy with charges of

heresy, which consisted of preaching irreverence for chattel slavery and the Southern oligarchy. The reader will doubtless recall the experience Lincoln had with a delegation of Springfield clergymen who interviewed him and departed firm in their determination to vote against him. Said Lincoln, holding a bible, "These men well know that I am for freedom in the Territories, freedom everywhere as far as the Constitution and laws will permit, and that my opponents are for slavery. They know this, and yet with this book in their hands, in the light of which human bondage cannot live a moment, they are going to vote against me."

Now, as to the modern labor movement. Let us recount the factors of modern economic development. These are, chiefly, the revolutionizing of science and of industry, and of the unprecedented conquest over nature and nature's powers. Let us remember that the progress of the capitalist method of production necessitates a constantly larger field for action, that it can exist only so long as it ever revolutionizes the means of wealth production, and that stagnation means death. Further, that all barriers in the way of boundary lines, confines of religious creeds and political beliefs had to be ruthlessly battered down before the new system could flourish.

Because of the kaleidoscopic changes, the last century, particularly the latter half, witnessed the acceptance of a new theory of development, the theory of evolution, and a revolution was worked in the basis for the examination of the principles of cosmogony, of biology, of ethics, of sociology, and the kindred sciences. The nineteenth century was well called the "wonderful century" by Wallace.

But synchronous with the marvelous achievements of science, the capitalist method of production attained its zenith of development in its monopolization of industry. And then the ruling class began to fear further discoveries and progress, in that they presaged change in property relations, and the once revolutionary, world-destroying bourgeoisie became ultra conservative, narrow and cowardly. So we find Haeckel complaining of "the mental relaxation which has lately set in, and the rising flood of reaction in the political, social and ecclesiastical world." The capitalist class abandons science, thanks to the good offices of which it came to be, and rushes to cover under whatever institution will protect it from the gathering storm. And so the ruling class to-day returns to its vomit, contritely bending its head and supplicating for pardon. So the Church is slyly lugged out from the scrap-heap, the cobwebs tenderly brushed away, and a little the worse for the rough treatment accorded it by the erstwhile irreligious bourgeoisie, is reinstated in its former seat behind the throne and restored to its prestige.

And so, in this free American republic, where Church and State are presumably divorced, the Church is again one of the instruments of the ruling class used to keep the ruled class in submission.

By the term church, the Catholic church need not be implied. But that the Catholic church as an institution is peculiarly fitted for the purpose the ruling class desires to serve cannot be gainsaid. More so than any other is its highly centralized form of organization calculated to fit in with the centralization of industry that is the characteristic feature of the present age. Industrial despotism will necessitate such ecclesiastical despotism as is exercised by the pope and the fathers of the Catholic church.

We need not look for a Catholic president, though Blaine's fate need not serve for a precedent. On the contrary, good presidential timber may be found in Charles J. Bonaparte, for example. Mr. Bonaparte is now secretary of the navy, as well as president of the National Municipal League. Still, Secretary Bonaparte does not exhaust the list of Catholic office-holders appointed by the President. In point of fact the Catholics have good grounds for echoing the sentiment recently expressed by a Catholic organ: "He certainly has been good to us." The future will testify to the soundness of Mark Hanna's prediction that, "when the conflict rages between the upper and lower classes, the Catholic church will be found on the side of the existing order."

Already experience has shown that it serves nought for such prelates as Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishops Ryan and Messmer to go out of their way to declare that the existing order is bound to remain. It appears, by decreasing church attendance, that such utterances do not satisfy the workingman that the existing order is bound to remain. It rather satisfies him that Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishops Ryan and Messmer side with the ruling class.

And the irreligion is bound to assume tangible shape when such men as John H. Converse, head of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, which is popularly known as the "little Hell on earth," are instrumental in arranging a course of sermons for trades unionists (the Baldwin Works are strictly non-union) and acting as treasurer of the finance committee of the Torrey-Alexander revival in Philadelphia.

We are now at the parting of the ways. If the preachers of the gospel ignore the great labor problem, their preachments will, for the average workingman, resolve themselves into so much rehash of mothworn platitudes and fustian. The workingman demands something more substantial. The labor question must be faced. And there can be no middle ground. "He

that is not for me is against me." If faced from the standpoint of the ruling class, the workingman tends to drift away from the Church. This is the spectacle that now confronts us.

All ministers, however, are not capitalist minded, no more than all preachers have in the past maintained the justice of conditions as they then existed. There were then and there are now notable exceptions. These exceptions, however, men of the stamp of the Rev. Crapsey, care little for belief in the miracles and the formalities of the Church. They deal with the application of its ethical teachings to life. And because Christ's teachings can be practiced only in a society of economic equals, preachers like the Rev. Crapsey cannot but be revolutionary, directing their energies to the overthrow of the present class system and the inauguration of the coming industrial democracy.

So, for the future, we may hardly expect the workingman to return to the Church. He will probably do his worshipping in his private closet. He will probably refuse to support the preacher who tells him to be "contented with his lot" because "labor is honorable." More likely is he to be of the opinion of the Rev. E. A. Wasson, of Newark, who declared at a gathering of Philadelphia's striking printers recently: "I don't believe that workingmen can ever expect much from us ministers as a class, for the reason that we are under the control of the class that is hostile to organized labor. The rich employing class control the preacher, either directly as members of his congregation — and not only the honest ones but all the biggest scamps of the country are active in the church, and the likeliest place to find a big financial rogue of a Sunday morning is in church — or indirectly through their retainers in our churches, their lawyers, doctors, secretaries, employees, customers, associates, poor relatives and hangers-on in general; or through the denomination, by placing the denomination under such financial obligations to them that the ecclesiastical powers that be will ruthlessly bar the objectionable preacher from promotion. You workingmen will have to work out your own salvation, as you have thus far. The men of God won't help you to any extent."

JOS. E. COHEN.

Concentration of Capital and the Disappearance of the Middle Class.

II

IN what relation does the existence or non-existence of a middle-class stand to the possibility or inevitability of Socialism? It is generally assumed that, according to Marx, all the middle-class must disappear and society become divided into a handful of capitalistic millionaires on the one hand and poor workingmen on the other before a socialist form of society can supplant our present capitalist system. There is, however, no warrant for such an assumption. Marx nowhere says so expressly. Nor is there anything in Marx's historico-philosophical views, that is, in his Materialistic Conception of History, from which the evolution of society depends entirely on the development of its economic forces. And in those passages of his great work where Marx speaks of the evolution of society from Capitalism to Socialism, it is only the social forces of production and distribution that claim his attention. But Marx is no fatalist. He does not believe that society develops automatically without the aid of the human beings who compose it, or of the social classes into which it is divided. He takes into consideration the human beings with which these social forces work. This is, in fact, the essence of his theory of the class-struggle. In this respect the different social classes have, according to his theory, their bearings on the evolution of society.

In his analysis of the evolutionary tendencies of the capitalist system Marx notes and accentuates the presence of a tendency to eliminate the small bourgeois or middle-class which he believes to be rapidly disappearing. He lays great stress on this point, and evidently believes it to be a movement of very great importance in the evolution of capitalism towards socialism. A careful reading of Marx, however, will not fail to disclose the fact that Marx did not consider the complete disappearance of that class all-essential, and that it was only the disappearance of that particular middle-class of which he treated that he considered of any importance at all. In other words, it was not the entire absence of any middle-class or social stratum between the big capitalists and the workingmen that he considered of importance for the realization of his socialist ideals, but it is the presence of a certain particular class, possessing certain particular characteristics (or at least its presence in any such great

numbers as would lend it social strength) that he considered obnoxious to the movement of society toward socialism. In order to understand thoroughly the Marxian position on this question we must consider his general estimate of the different classes or strata of society as factors in the evolution of society from capitalism to socialism. And that, again, we can only understand if we consider them in the light of the Materialistic Conception of History. This we shall now proceed to do.

Our readers are already familiar with the Marxian philosophy of history from the discussion in the early chapters of this work. We have there shown the absurdity of the claim that Marx and his followers denied the influence of ideas on the course of history. Here we want to go a step farther and say that, in a sense, Marx was one of the most idealistic of philosophers. And the sense in which we mean it is in relation to this very question of the influence of ideas. Marx believed in the reality of ideas, both as to origin and influence. There were philosophers who, like Hegel, did not believe in the reality of our material world. They believed that the only real world was the world of ideas, and that the material world was only a manifestation of the development of the absolute idea which developed according to laws of development contained within itself. To such philosophers there could, of course, be no question of the influence of ideas on the course of history. To them there was nothing real in the whole course of history except this development of the idea. These philosophers are, of course, the real idealists (and, incidentally, more deterministic than Marx). But of those philosophers who believe in the materiality of the material world, Marx is easily foremost in the *reality* which he ascribes to ideas. According to Marx, ideas are firmly *rooted in reality* and are therefore of abiding influence while they last, and not easily susceptible of change. In this he radically differs from those to whom ideas have a mere ærial existence, coming from the land of nowhere, without any particular reason in our historic existence and, therefore, vanishing without regard to our social environment, its needs or tribulations. This Marxian esteem of ideas must always be borne in mind when discussing the influence of the human being as a factor in the making of his own history. Let us, therefore, keep it in mind in the following discussion.

What are the characteristics of the socialist system of society in which it differs chiefly from our present capitalist system? First, the social ownership of the means of production — the absence of private property in them. Second, the carrying on of all industry on a co-operative basis — the absence of industrial individual enterprise. Third, the management of all

industrial enterprise democratically — all “captains” of industry and all other industrial dignitaries to be elective instead of appointed by divine prerogative, and to hold office by the consent and during the pleasure of the governed.

Now let us see what classes of our present society are suited to bring about such changes, and what are not. The bearer of the socialist revolution is the modern Proletariat. It is the class of the proletarians that has the historic mission of tearing down the capitalist system of society. Remember well: not the poor man, nor the workingman, but the proletarian, is going to do this work. There were poor men before, so were there workingmen. But they were not proletarians. So may there be poor now, and there may even be poor workingmen who are not proletarians. The modern proletarian is not merely a poor man, nor is he necessarily a poor man in the ordinary sense of the word. Nor is he *merely* a workingman, although he necessarily is one. He is a workingman — usually poor at that — under peculiar historic conditions. Those conditions are that he is not possessed of any property, that is, the only property that counts socially, — means of production. By reason of this condition he is placed in certain social relations, both as to his own kind and as to his social betters, as well as to the social machinery. Through this he acquires certain characteristics of mind and body, a certain mentality and psychology which make him peculiarly fitted for this task.

We will not attempt to give here an exhaustive description of his mental and psychological nature. We will denote his character by a contrast: he is in every way just the reverse of the peasant. He had to be that, according to Marx, in order to be a fitting instrument for the carrying out of his historical mission. Marx's attitude towards the peasant is most characteristic. The peasant was a positive abhorrence to him, and he eliminated him from his promised land. This had the peculiar consequence that in countries where the peasantry is now undergoing the process of “capitalization,” as in Russia, for instance, the Marxists have been accused by the peasant-loving utopians of all sorts of horrible designs against the poor peasants. Of course, Marx and the Marxists have nothing but compassion for these poor people. But, besides seeing clearly the hopelessness of their case, they recognize the fact that the peasant, were he to exist, would be the greatest obstacle in the way of socialism. First let us note his ideas as to property. By reason of his occupation and the environment in which he and his forefathers have lived for ages, he has contracted such a love for his land, his house, his cattle, and everything else which he calls his own, that he will find it more difficult to separate from them than a millionaire

from his millions. Their worthlessness has nothing to do with the case: their value can hardly be measured in money. This colors all his ideas about property. He and his forefathers before him have lived on this particular spot of land, and all his family history is connected with it. Here are buried the labors and sufferings of generations. All his own woes, and his pleasant memories (if he has any) are intimately associated with this patch of ground. Here he was born and here he hopes to die. Every tree, every building, is the result of his own and his family's great cares and labors. Every animal is his friend and companion in toil and misery. Most of them have been reared by him, even as were his own children. He will not enter the promised land if he has to give up his ruined, worthless, tax-eaten property for it. The "sacredness" of property rights to peasant, the tenacity with which he holds on to it is well recognized by those who have studied his character. This "idea" of his as to private-property, in view of his stolidity and immobility, due to the immobility of his surroundings and the sameness of the method and nature of his work, would make him an inveterate enemy of socialism and a stout upholder of capitalism. But, aside from this, he is unfitted for a socialist society, and particularly unfitted to make a fight for it, because of his inability to co-operate with others. A peasant is the greatest individualist imaginable, at least as far as boorishness, suspicion, opinionatedness, and the other "individualist" virtues are concerned. For centuries he has led an isolated and self-sufficient existence. He lived by his own toil without the help of others. He never came into contact with others except to be robbed and oppressed and occasionally to be cheated. No wonder he is such an individualist. Nor has he been fitted by the countless generations of oppression which he has undergone, or by the work to which he is accustomed, to the arduous and complicated duties of a self-governed industrial community. All this would make the old-fashioned peasant an inveterate enemy of socialism, notwithstanding his great poverty and ruined existence, if he were to survive. But he is not to survive. We cannot enter here upon a discussion of the so-called agrarian problem. One thing may be stated, however, without any fear of contradiction: the old peasant, as Marx knew him, and the old economic surroundings and social environment which produced him, are no more, except in very backward countries, and there he is disappearing before the onward march of capitalism. With the old-fashioned peasant passes away the mainstay of private property and the bulwark of reaction. There is no other social class that could quite fill his place in this respect.

The bourgeois has few of the characteristics of the peas-

ant. He is quick and on the *qui vive*. His love and attachment for property are not as pronounced as those of the peasant. He has not the kind of property which becomes individualized and may be personified. He has himself produced none of it. He cannot form any lasting friendship with his stock of goods or the machines used in his manufactory. They are liable to constant change and can be easily supplanted by others of their kind. In most cases it is in their quick disposal that his chief advantage lies and he parts with them without regret. As a matter of fact he never cared about them: it is their money value or equivalent that is dear to him. In other words, it is not the property itself that he values or cares for, but the advantage derived from its possession, although in some cases, particularly where business is done in the old-fashioned way, and life arranged correspondingly, there may be some love of property as such with reference to some kinds of property: usually the place of business or abode and its furnishings and belongings.

With these characteristics the bourgeois is ill-adapted to take the place of the peasant as a defender of property and of reaction. Yet, Marx considers his disappearance of considerable importance for the inauguration of the socialist state. Why?

To the vulgar materialists who insist on calling themselves Marxists this question presents no difficulty. They reduce the Materialist Conception of History to the simple formula: "everybody for his own pocket." And as the pockets of the bourgeoisie are presumably going to be injured by the transformation from capitalism to socialism, that class must necessarily be against the change, and therefore it must be removed in some way in order to pave the way for socialism. This perversion of the Materialistic Conception of History is, unfortunately, very widespread, and for good reason: It is a reproduction of the practice and theory of capitalism. Of the "common" practice, of course, but also of the very highest theory of which capitalism is capable. It is, in effect, a mere paraphrase of the "intelligent egoism"—the greatest height to which the capitalist intellect could rise. The fact that this theory can easily be proven to be logically absurd and historically false will not diminish its vogue as long as the condition to which it owes its origin remain unchanged. Only gradually, following in the wake of the economic changes, and at a distance at that, will a truer understanding force its way.

Except in the case of seers like Marx. With all his dislike for the bourgeoisie Marx never believed that all bourgeois, or their intellectual and moral leaders, simply followed the dictates of their pockets, personal or otherwise, as can easily be seen from numerous passages scattered in his many writings, and particularly in the "18th of Brumaire."

What makes the bourgeois character unfit for socialist co-operation, and his ideology one of the chief mainstays of capitalism is the independence which the possession of property gives him. While he has no particular love for his property, or, to be more exact, for the objects of his property, he values very much the independent *social status* which the possession of property gives him, no matter what this property consists of. As a matter of fact it is not the particular property that he is concerned about, but its social exchange-value. For the purpose of his social status it is not the actual objects of his property that count, but the social properties and possibilities which attach to all property. That is why he stands up for the abstract principle of private property, something which the peasant is very little concerned about as long as its practical enjoyment is not interfered with. The social existence of the old-fashioned bourgeois, his everyday economic life, make him accustomed to strive for and cherish this independence founded upon the possession of property and his ideology becomes decidedly individualistic. In his foremost intellectual representatives this crystallizes into some such system as that of Herbert Spencer, and looks upon socialism as a form of slavery. The alertness and aggressiveness of the class only accentuate the craving of each individual for absolute economic freedom, for being let alone to fight the battles of life. And the success of the class only whets its appetite for further conquests, and makes it impatient of any restraint, while its intellectual achievements give it one of the brightest weapons ever wielded by a ruling class.

A good deal has been written and said about the supposed great influence of force as a social factor, and again the vulgar materialists have contributed their little share to the general confusion. Of course brute force has been and will be used by all ruling classes, both in acquiring and maintaining their dominion. But brute force alone never did and never could sustain a ruling class for any considerable length of time. In order to see the correctness of this assertion it is sufficient to bring to mind the fact that the ruling class is always a minority, usually a small one, of the population of a country, and that, taken man for man, the members of the ruling class seldom possess more strength than the members of the subject class. The force of the ruling class is not natural but acquired, and is social in its character. It consists in its organization which permits it to use part of the strength of the subject class, and sometimes the whole of it, for the subjugation of that class. Sometimes the mere fact of its own organized condition may be sufficient to hold the superior but disorganized force of the subject-class in awe and trembling. But even then it is not mere brute force, for organization itself

is a moral force and not a physical force, which is evidenced by our language, in which we speak of a physically superior force, which is incapable of properly exerting itself for lack of proper organization and discipline, being "demoralized." But this is true in only exceptional cases. Usually the ruling class depends on something outside its own organization to maintain its supremacy. This something is the social organization of the whole community or nation. It is by using the power of the whole social system for its own purposes that the ruling class is able to maintain its supremacy at a time when that is clearly against the general interest or against the interest of large portions of the subject class or classes.

The basis of this social power exercised by the ruling class is usually the economic system in vogue, which makes the subject-class economically necessarily dependent upon the ruling class. But this does not always suffice. Very often, therefore, the ruling class depends, to some extent at least, on purely moral suasion for the continuance of its power: Religion was, therefore, from time immemorial, the handmaid of the temporal power, except where it was itself a temporal power, and thus united in itself the functions of mistress and maid. With the waning of religion and the passing of its influence, science and philosophy have taken its place, and usually perform the same functions with equal alacrity and facility. That does not mean, of course, that either religion or science and philosophy were invented by the ruling classes in order to keep the subject classes in bondage. The ruling classes merely make use — sometimes proper and sometimes improper — of a means which they find at hand. The point is that usually the lower classes get their "ideas" — their religion, science, art, philosophy — from the upper classes, and they are apt to be such as express and represent — in short "idealize" — the mode of life of those classes and the principles underlying the same. This is always true when the subject-class depends on it mostly for its economic existence. At such times the economic virility of the ruling class expresses itself in a buoyant and aggressive ideology which seems to, and often does, express the interests and aspirations of society as a whole. But no ruling class has ever had such a great opportunity of exercising such great moral or ideal influence on its subject class as has the bourgeoisie, owing to the great and manifold development of the arts and sciences during the time it held its sway. This unprecedented wealth of ideas has had the remarkable effect, first of all, of making the bourgeoisie itself drunk with its power and almost mad in its desires and aspirations. No king has ever believed himself more God-chosen to rule than has the bourgeoisie, nor has any ruling class ever laid such pretensions to the absoluteness and immutability of the laws of its rule

as does the bourgeoisie. Or, rather, we should say, as *did* the bourgeoisie in the heyday of its power. And while it was in the heyday of its power the bourgeoisie managed to permeate the working class with its ideals, habits and modes of thought, perhaps more than any ruling class ever influenced a subject class. This was due, on the one hand to the unprecedentedly large extent to which the working class has been permitted to participate in the benefits resulting from the general spread of knowledge, and on the other hand the peculiarly forcible way in which the economic argument is brought home to the modern workingman. Under no preceding social system have the economic woes of the ruling class been so quickly and with such dreadful effect reflected on the subject-class. We must, therefore, never forget the great importance which the influence of the bourgeois ideology has on the modern proletariat, particularly in the early stages of its development, although, as we shall see later, that during and by virtue of its development it formulates an ideology of its own.

The capitalistic "ideas" and habits of mind are inculcated into the working class by the capitalist class, intentionally and unintentionally, by and through its lower strata, or what is usually called the "middle class." So long as there is a large and virile middle class the working class will be largely under its domination and influence, morally and aesthetically. It is with this class that the working class comes into immediate contact socially. It is on this class that the workingman fixes his hopes and aspirations for the future. It is this class that teaches him at kindergarten and at school, that preaches to him at church and at "ethical" societies, and it is this class that gathers and sifts for him the news of the world and explains to him in his daily newspaper, and gives his popular science, his art and his "literature."

It is because of those "ideal" characteristics of the old-fashioned bourgeois, the old middle-class of capitalist society, and even more so because of the "ideal" influence of that class on the working class, that Marx considered its disappearance of such great importance in the movement of society towards socialism. That is, in so far as he considered such disappearance of any moment in itself, outside of its being a mere indication of the movement of the economic forces of society. For it must always be borne in mind that it is the development of the economic forces that is the real power-working for socialism, and any influence which any class or group of men may have on that movement, except as an expression of such development, is merely secondary.

L. B. BOUDIN.

Corporations and the Middle Class.

IN the June installment of Mr. L. B. Boudin's admirable series of articles now running in the REVIEW, dealing with that phase of the concentration of capital and the disappearance of the middle class wherein there is an apparent need of revision of the Marxian philosophy to account for a seeming avenue of expansion for the middle class by diffusion as corporation stockholders into the concentrating industries of the country, I disagree with the author when he says: "Here, then, is a check to the development of capitalistic society as outlined by Marx—a check which is destined to arrest or at least retard that development. The formula of centralization of wealth and of the disappearance of the middle class evidently needs revision."

The limitations of the world market compelling our material progress to proceed by expansion and contraction, in times of expansion, like the present, with us at least, the appearance is given of a new lease of life for the middle class. Concentration of the opportunities for investment into the corporate or collective form naturally carries with it the necessity of investment in the altered form of opportunity, as long as the means for investment are present. As the movement from country to city is but in response to the altered form of industry, so is the investing movement of the middle class in response to an alteration in the diminishing forms of opportunity.

So long as expansion prevails corporation stocks as an investment will seem a safe enough avenue by which to prolong the life of the middle class. But whenever contraction sets in, as it must, owing to the limitations of the world market, and a period of stagnation follows, capital must turn and feed upon itself, the great capitalist absorbing the small by the process of intercapital elimination. Corporation stocks as one of the diminishing forms of middle class investment are really a net from which none of the small fry may escape, their opportunities having been concentrated into bait which they were bound to follow in order to continue their urban existence. They were not taken in for any service to be performed, but for the capital they brought or the small industries they consented to merge with the element of their personal direction and ownership wholly eliminated. The next step in their personal direction is to be themselves eliminated by intercapital competition enforced and grown fierce by a period of contraction naturally succeeding one of expansion.

J. W. BRACKETT.

Socialists and the Chicago Charter.

THE Socialists of Chicago are at present moment engaged in a work such as has never been attempted, at least on as large a scale, by the socialist party of this country. Their experience in this new field may possibly be of value to socialists in other parts of the country, and a knowledge of their work will probably bring to their aid the co-operation of those in other localities who are able to give valuable suggestions.

The government of the city of Chicago, like that of most American cities is the result of a rapid patch-work growth. As a result it is contradictory, — and, what is worst of all in bourgeois minds, extremely expensive in performing its functions. In the hope of consolidating and reducing the number of independent taxing bodies, and thereby reducing taxation, the last legislature took steps toward the formation of a new charter.

For the purpose of formulating a draft of a charter a most anomalous body, called a charter convention, was created. This body consists of a number of men appointed by such diverse authorities as the Legislature, the governor, the mayor, the city council, the park board, the library board, the drainage trustees, etc. This convention has no legal power, further than to recommend a charter to the legislature. The legislature, in turn, must submit its work to the referendum.

Since the members of the charter convention are not salaried, and have no patronage or other political spoils to dispose of, the regular politicians showed no great desire to become members. So it happens that although Tom Carey, Johnny Powers, and a few other notorious spoilsmen are members, yet they have taken little or no part in the proceedings, and the work is being done largely by what the politicians are accustomed to designate as the "long haired bunch," — the professional reformers, members of the "Voters' Leagues," Settlement workers, etc. These men are usually radical and honest, and willing to consider whatever may be brought to their attention. To be sure, the powers that be were not foolish enough to permit these men to be in a majority, and the machinery of the convention is carefully retained in the hands of the representatives of capitalist interests; yet on the whole it is probable that the result will be a charter which will be of a much more liberal character than any possessed by any great city at the present time.

The convention has divided its membership up into a large number of committees, on Education, Taxation, Municipal Util-

ities, etc., and these sub-committees hold open sessions to which they invite anyone interested in the subjects covered. The charter convention as a whole also proposes to hold open sessions to which non-members will be invited to present any matter that should properly come before the convention.

The Socialist Party of Chicago early determined to take advantage of the opportunities here offered both for agitation, and also for attainment of such measures as will further action later when the city government shall begin to fall into the hands of the workers. Before the first session of the charter convention, Comrade William Bross Lloyd, drew up a draft for a charter embodying the socialist positions as to municipal government and it was published in the *Chicago Socialist*. Copies of this were sent to some of the members of the charter convention, and when they began their deliberations, this was the only draft of a charter before them. The ability with which it was drawn and the completeness with which it met the situation attracted the attention even of those who were bitter opponents of almost its every provision, to such an extent that the convention sent over to the office of the *Chicago Socialist* and purchased sufficient copies to supply its entire membership.

Thus from the very beginning socialist influence began to make itself felt. But there was a general feeling that the work of the socialists should be directly under the control of the party and should be carried on in a systematic manner. Consequently the Cook County Central Committee appointed a Charter Committee having one member for each of the various sub-committees of the Charter convention, as follows:

1. Committee on municipal elections, appointments and tenure of office—James S. Smith.
2. Committee on municipal executive and departmental organization—C. L. Breckon.
3. Committee on municipal legislature—Wm. B. Lloyd.
4. Committee on municipal courts—M. H. Taft.
5. Committee on municipal taxation and revenue.—E. H. Winston.
6. Committee on municipal expenditures and accounting—J. B. Smiley.
7. Committee on the relations of the municipality to other organizations and public authorities—S. Stedman.
8. Committee on public education—Mrs. May Wood Simons.
9. Committee on public utilities—Walter Thomas Mills.
10. Committee on penal, charitable and reformatory institutions—A. M. Simons.
11. Committee on municipal parks and public grounds—Mrs. Corinne Brown.

12. Law Committee—Peter Sissman.
13. Committee on rivers and harbors—Joseph Medill Patterson.
14. Committee on rules, procedure and general plan—Carl Strover.

These persons will meet with the various sub-committees to which they have been assigned and will present to them the socialist position regarding any matters that may be under discussion, in so far as they are given the floor. They also meet as a committee of socialists to discuss the work which they are doing and consider any matters that may require the combined ideas of the whole committee. Each one endeavors to make himself familiar with the field to which he has been assigned, by study of what has been done in other cities of this country and Europe and this will in itself prove of value for future work by and for the Socialist Party.

The work of the charter convention will be subject to a referendum after revision by the legislature, and this fact, backed by the knowledge of the existence of fifty thousand socialist votes in Chicago will compel attention to the proposals of the Socialists. Moreover there is a law in Illinois which enables a referendum to be initiated by a much fewer number of signatures than the socialist party, with its organization, could gather in a very short time. To be sure the resulting referendum has only "advisory" power, but when that advice is backed by a rapidly growing party it is apt to be more effective than when supported only by ephemeral reform bodies.

The work of the socialists has not as yet taken sufficiently definite form to permit publication. It may be stated that the general principle underlying their efforts is to secure as great municipal autonomy as possible. With the present city charter, the capture of the city of Chicago would at once involve the Socialists in a struggle with the state authorities, and might easily lead to violent outbreaks. If the interference of the state can be reduced to a minimum, this conflict can be largely avoided, or at the least the socialists will have the slight advantage of the formal law on their side.

A. M. SIMONS.

EDITORIAL

What of Bryan?

With little beyond a voice and strong pair of lungs as capital William Jennings Bryan shot into the public vision, and the nomination for the presidency, through a single speech in 1896. Ever since then he has been the "peerless leader" of what, until a few months ago was a steadily, and fairly rapidly diminishing band of followers. Now, all at once, while on a tour around the world, he awakes once more to find himself apparently about to have a third presidential nomination thrust upon him.

The immediate cause of this latest revival is an article contributed by him to the *Century Magazine*, which might well have been labeled, "A few of the Things I do not know about Socialism." But the main point was that he distinctly disavowed being a socialist, and made an attack on something which he evidently thinks is socialism,— and what is more important, which quite a number of other people must think is socialism. Since he was always reactionary in his political philosophy, it was only necessary for him to place the label which disavowed his socialism in a prominent place to make him acceptable to the most thorough-going defenders of the "interests."

For many reasons he is more acceptable than Roosevelt. He does not know so much, for one thing. His article in the *Century* can always be instanced as proof of any degree of ignorance which may be desired. He is more "dependable" for another thing. Bryan conscientiously believes that capitalism is right, while no one on earth has ever been able to tell what Roosevelt believed in for more than five minutes at a time.

Yet after all, we are not inclined to take the Bryan boom very seriously. It looks very much as if it were started so early in order that it may have plenty of time to explode before it is ready to bear fruit. (Excuse the mixed metaphor.) It seems much more probable that after Bryan has been used to divide the Hearst forces, that he will be quietly assisted to one side while some man more immediately and directly controlled by the "interests" is given the nomination.

HOW WILL WE MEET IT?

The trial of Haywood, Moyer and Pettibone has been postponed until after the fall elections to determine whether the workers are really as indignant as they have been saying they were. That is the simplest, plainest, fullest explanation of the latest action of the Standard Oil Judge in Idaho. If at these elections the Socialist Party vote falls off, or makes but a small increase, then the ruling power will be perfectly justified in concluding that all the talk and resolutions were but bluff, and that it will be perfectly safe to proceed with the legalized murdering. If the workers expend their time between now and then in issuing bombastic manifestos, like the one that has just appeared from the office of the I. W. W., without the least sign of a recommendation to the workers to use their most effective weapon—the ballot-box—then the capitalists need fear no interference. The I. W. W. has done magnificent work in the gathering of funds and conducting of agitation meetings, but it is now permitting all these to pass by without pointing out the logical conclusion.

It is for the Socialist Party to now perform the only work which will really be effective in saving the lives of our comrades. Every congressional district must this fall be made to ring, not simply with wild denunciation of the outrage of keeping innocent men in prison for nearly a year in defiance of every form of law and justice, but with clear cold analysis of the causes that have impelled to this action, and constant repetition of the path which must be taken to free them and avenge the outrage which has been perpetrated upon them.

* * *

NO ESCAPING THE BEEF TRUST.

Those whom the recent packing house exposures have made vegetarians are simply fleeing to "ills they know not of," as yet at least. They are not even escaping from the clutches of that dread ogre of the middle-class — the Beef Trust. Not to mention the fact that practically all the fresh fruit is handled in Armour or Swift refrigerator cars, the news now comes from California that the Packing Houses are going into the fruit canning industry. Libby McNeil and Co., which is but a branch of Swift's is establishing a chain of canning factories in the fruit belt of California, and with complete control of the transportation facilities, by which to depress the price of fresh fruit for export and secure rebates on canned goods, the tale of the little canner will be short, — he will be "canned."

A further light is cast on several dark places in the capitalist Jungle, when it is pointed out that Edward M. Tilden, the Superintendent of Libby, McNeil & Co., is a representative of important Standard Oil interests. This is but one of the numerous not generally known facts which connect Rockefeller and the Standard Oil System with the Beef Trust.

Tilden is also the political manager of Beef Trust interests in Chicago, and the President of the Chicago School Board, to which position he was elected by the votes of the appointees of Mayor Dunne, the Hearst Democrat. Great are the ramifications of capitalism.

* * *

Capitalism seems to be panic stricken, if we are to judge from the recent expressions of its foremost spokesmen. Those who with ponderous platitudes instruct the rising generation at college commencements, as well as those who deal out wisdom by the yard in the columns of our most respectable periodicals, all seem to be possessed with one idea, "What shall we do to be saved?" from Socialism. The general tone of these preachments seems to be that if the capitalists will only "be good" they can prevent the threatened deluge. Meanwhile, as always, the substantial rewards of capitalism are going to those who refuse to "be good."

* * *

Our attention has just been called to the fact that we were in error last month in stating that the suggestion of a general strike in case of the judicial murder of our comrades of the Western Federation of Miners was first made by Comrade Wilshire. The suggestion was clearly made in Comrade Debs' article in the *Appeal to Reason*, "Arouse ye Slaves." The idea of having this last resort ready for use is steadily spreading.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

SPAIN.

The recent attempt to assassinate the king by means of a dynamite bomb having led to the usual amount of lying by the capitalist press about the identity of the Socialists and the anarchists, the Berlin *Vorwärts* published a survey of the anarchist movement in Spain from which the following is taken:

In the first place there is really little reason to believe that the attack was by an anarchist at all, but that it was but the despairing act of one of the hundreds of thousands of starving subjects of the young king who had been driven a trifle swifter toward their death by the taxation to meet the expense necessary to the barbaric display accompanying the royal wedding.

Spanish anarchy, in philosophy and practice is a natural off-spring of bourgeois radicalism, and the Manchester school of political economy, which maintains that every extension of state activity is an evil. From the very beginning of the International Workingmen's Movement thirty years ago Spain has had a strong anarchist movement, which is only within recent years being overcome by the growth of socialism. In 1882 the anarchist movement reached its height. At that time an anarchist congress was held in Sevilla with 251 delegates, representing 209 local organizations, having 632 sub-divisions and 49,500 members. As the strength increased the divisions multiplied until at the present time there are three well-defined schools with numerous minor sects and subdivisions.

First in influence and energy, but not in numbers are the *Individualist* anarchists. They are mainly composed of the impoverished "intellectuals," especially the literary "Bohemians," and the poor teachers. Along with these are found many handworkers, and embittered Free-thinkers, who are attracted by their hatred of the Spanish priesthood. The genuine laborer, especially the members of the industrial proletariat, plays a very insignificant part in their movement. As a means to the attainment of their ends this division depends upon keeping up a constant unrest and agitation against the government and its supporters, largely by means of general strikes, street demonstrations, and occasionally by violent attacks upon prominent supporters and officials of the existing system.

The *second* division, the *Collectivist-Anarchist*, might be designated as the anarchistic trade-union group, since it is composed almost entirely of the organizations connected with the anarchistic "Federation of the Labor Unions of Spain," in opposition to the socialist "General Labor Union." Although these talk much of a future collectivist regime, yet, like the individualists, they preach political abstinence (although by no

means always practicing it), and advocate the General Strike and public demonstrations.

The *third*, the *Communist Anarchist* group, is very much like the Collectivists, but maintains that the foundation of the future society, to consist of independent producing communities, must be based upon the common ownership of the earth and the means of production.

Not only in regard to tactics, but in their whole comprehension of economic and political relations, the historic foundations of present society, and the direction of its evolution, the anarchists are fundamentally different from the socialists. They are much closer to the Liberal movement than to the Socialists.

Anarchy will disappear from Spain only when the corruption, the government by cliques, and the exploitation of the country by clericalism disappears—and when the working class shall awake to independent political life and organize itself into a great socialist party that shall relentlessly expose and denounce the corruption, and point the way to its abolition.

BELGIUM.

The recent legislative elections in Belgium are discussed at considerable length by Camille Huysmans in a recent number of the *Neue Zeit*. It seems that the election was an extremely hardly contested one. The Clericals, feeling their power slipping away, went to greatest lengths to retain their following. It had been shown in the Chamber of Deputies that for some time the Clericals had been making use of the clergy, nuns, monks, and clerical teachers to maintain a system of personal espionage over the most private affairs of the Belgian people, and that this information had been used in connection with the great capitalists to terrorize the workers into supporting the Clerical Party. The most absurd reports were circulated concerning the socialists—that they proposed to destroy the churches, drive out the worshippers with bayonets, etc., and cartoons depicting these horrible prospects were circulated among all the more ignorant of the workers.

Moreover the electoral lists were in the possession of the Clericals and they used this power for the most wholesale frauds.

The Liberals, raised the cry that only through them could salvation from the clerical terror be secured, and since the socialists had formed an alliance with the Liberals in many parts of the country, the whole affair was in confusion, and consequently the socialist vote did not receive as much of an increase as had been expected. However two additional seats were gained for the socialists giving them thirty instead of twenty-eight as before, and a slight increase in the vote registered.

One of the reasons for the comparatively slow growth of the socialist vote during the last two years, is due to the fact that the small retailers and their friends, in Brussels are very much enraged against the socialist co-operatives, which are driving all the little merchants out of business.

Another cause that tended to retard the increase of the socialist vote was that the Liberals stole all of the socialist platform that they dared, including many of the "immediate demands."

RUSSIA.

The Progressive Woman's Party of St. Petersburg, has sent the following energetic resolution to the Douma, which body is giving it consideration:

"In the name of the well-being of the Russian people, the Progressive Woman's Party protests against any legislative action what-

ever by the Imperial Douma so long as women are excluded from its ranks. It demands that the representatives of the people, must first of all see to it that the entire population of the Russian Empire, including the women, have the right of suffrage. The Progressive Woman's Party appeals to the sense of justice of the representatives of the Russian people, and expresses the hope that the Russian women may immediately receive their political rights, and become transformed from slaves without any rights whatever into complete legal citizens."

Comparisons between the French and the Russian Revolutions grow ever closer, but not without the development of some striking distinctions. The sessions of the Douma are growing more and more like those of the General Assembly. Although all precautions were taken to exclude socialists, yet a strong body of socialists has developed. Like the "Mountain" they are becoming the dominant party. There is this tremendous difference, however, that behind them stands the mighty power of the International Proletariat.

Only the other day the new Russian legislative assembly was forced to listen to eulogies of Lieut. Schmidt, whose tragic death has been described in these pages.

Moreover the Douma is now arranging for investigations of the massacres of the Jews. While no effective legal action can be taken by them in this regard, yet they can do as the socialists of all other lands have done in legislative chambers; make it the sounding board to give force to their propaganda. Indeed, it is as an organ of publicity that the socialists have always mostly utilized legislative bodies to which they were elected.

In the meantime the socialists have in no way relaxed their attacks and criticisms of the Douma itself. A recent meeting of the Socialist and the Socialist Revolutionary parties in St. Petersburg condemned the new legislative body in strong terms. The latest press dispatches would indicate that the Czar had determined to throw himself into the arms of the radical bourgeoisie and permit the formation of a radical parliamentary government, in the hope of thereby staying off the complete collapse of the autocracy.

The two demands on which the Russian ship of state seems about to be wrecked are those of complete amnesty of political prisoners and the division of land. To yield on either of these or to either side is to confess defeat and invite destruction.

FRANCE.

The united socialist party has decided to pursue an absolutely clear cut policy founded upon the class-struggle in its legislative work and has therefore refused to present any candidate for the presidency of the Chamber. At a former session Jaures was presented and was elected as one of the vice-presidents, and a like result would have been certain this time had the party so desired. This item is especially referred to those who never tire of telling how the socialists are rejecting the narrow Marxian tactics.

TASMANIA.

It is encouraging to see the progress made in Tasmania — seven Labor men have been returned where only four were in the previous Parliament. Our comrade, George Burns, M.H.A., for Queenstown, had a fine majority of 619. Our comrades of Victoria all heartily congratulate Mr. and Mrs. Burns on the victory. No doubt it is an indication of a deter-

mination on the part of the Tassie workers to catch up to and keep up to the movement in other States. All good success to them.—*The Socialist*, Melbourne.

ITALY.

Hunger riots have recently occurred in Sardinia, which were put down with violence by the troops. So terrible have the conditions been on this island that for several years marriages and births have fallen off in a most striking manner. While sheriffs' sales average but 29 per 100,000 population annually in the remainder of Italy, in Sardinia they reach 422 per 100,000, with the overwhelming majority for between five and twenty dollars.

REPORT OF SECRETARY TO INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU.

To the National Committee, Socialist Party,

DEAR COMRADES:—In submitting this, my second report, of the work and proceedings of the International Socialist Bureau, I can do no better than to give a brief summary of the proceedings of the Bureau at its last regular meeting.

The meeting was held in Brussels in the month of March, and I did not personally attend it.

I received a copy of the minutes of the proceedings but a short time ago. Hence the delay in my report.

The question of the basis of representation and mode of voting in International Socialist conventions and Bureau meetings which had occupied the attention of the Bureau for the past year, was disposed of by the adoption of the following set of resolutions:

"I. The following organizations shall be admitted to the International conventions:

A. All associations which adhere to the essential principles of Socialism: the socialization of the means of production and exchange; the international union and action of the working class, and the socialist conquest of the powers of government by the proletariat organized as a class party.

B. All organizations which, while they do not directly take part in the political movement, stand on the basis of the class struggle and recognize the necessity of political action, legislative and parliamentary.

II. A. The associations and organizations of each nationality form one section, which passes upon the admissibility of all associations and organizations of that nationality.

If any association or organization is not admitted by the section of its nationality, it has the right to appeal to the International Socialist Bureau, whose decision on the matter is final.

B. The secretary of each affiliated party or the national committee of the affiliated organizations in each country, where such national committee is constituted, shall transmit to the various socialist organizations of their respective countries, the invitations to take part in the international conventions and the resolutions adopted by the International Socialist Bureau.

C. The text of all motions must be in possession of the Bureau at least four (4) months before the date fixed for the international congress, and distributed by the Bureau one month after their receipt. No new resolutions will be accepted, distributed or discussed if they have not been submitted in the manner above indicated, except matters of urgency. The International Socialist Bureau is alone competent to decide upon the

question of urgency. All amendments or resolutions should be submitted to the International Socialist Bureau in writing, and the Bureau will decide whether such amendments are admissible or whether they merely attempt to introduce new resolutions under the guise of amendments.

III. The method of voting in international conventions shall be determined by the following rules:

A. The vote shall be by delegates, except when three nations demand a vote by nationalities, in which case the vote shall be taken by nationalities.

B. As nationalities, are regarded the aggregate body of inhabitants living under the same government. But the Bureau may also in exceptional cases consider as nationalities the bodies of inhabitants whose aspirations for autonomy and moral unity are the result of a long historical government, provided however, that the latter decision shall not alter the proportion in the number of the votes of the section.

C. Each section shall have a number of votes varying from two to twenty according to a list which shall be prepared for the first time by the Bureau in office in 1906 to 1907. The number of votes for each section shall be fixed with regard to

(a) The number of dues-paying members of the parties, bearing in mind the number of inhabitants.

(b) The importance of the nationality.

(c) The strength of trade unions and co-operative socialist organizations.

(d) The political power of the Socialist Party or parties.

The number of dues-paying members shall be proved by all documents and papers which the Bureau may demand. Should there be two or more different parties within one section, the distribution of votes among such parties shall be made by the parties themselves, and, in case of a disagreement, by the Bureau. The list shall be revised periodically, or as circumstances may demand.

IV. An International Socialist Bureau organized on the basis of representation by national sections, shall continue the function of such sections. Each section may send to the Bureau two accredited delegates. The places of the delegates may be filled by substitutes elected by the affiliated parties.

V. The Bureau has a permanent secretary, whose functions have been determined by the Paris convention of 1900. The seat of the Bureau shall be at Brussels, and the Belgian delegation shall serve as the Executive Committee.

VI. The dues of every party shall commence in the month of January of each year, and shall be fixed on a scale periodically to be adopted by the Bureau.

These resolutions practically constitute the first attempt to codify and regulate the rights of the various socialist parties and labor organizations in the international conventions and the International Bureau.

The resolutions are not final, since they will have to be submitted for approval to the next international convention, and one or two parts are adopted only provisionally, and will be again considered by the International socialist bureau at its next regular meeting.

The committee also adopted unanimously the International Socialist Peace Resolution offered sometime ago by our French comrades through Vaillant and Jaures. The resolution is the same which was recently adopted by our National Committee, and need not be repeated here. The vote of our party had been sent in by me prior to the meeting, and was counted as cast in favor of the resolution.

One of the most notable features of the meeting was the report of the secretary of the International Bureau, Camille Huysmans, covering the work of the Bureau for the year 1905. The present secretary of the

Bureau assumed office in February 1903, and during the short time of his incumbency, he succeeded admirably in extending and strengthening the activity of the Bureau. In order to establish closer relations between the various affiliated parties and the Bureau, a system of monthly reports was introduced, which reports contain brief accounts of the work accomplished, and the correspondence exchanged by the Bureau, and are regularly submitted by the Secretary to the delegates of the various national parties. The reports are written in French, but during the last few months the secretary has been accompanying them by a brief summary in German, and it is expected that within a short time the reports will be published and sent out simultaneously in three languages: French, German and English. The Executive Committee of the Bureau has also taken steps to procure from the representatives of the various national parties quarter-annual or semi-annual reports of the socialist and labor movements in their respective countries. These reports will be printed in the three principal languages, and it is expected that they will develop into interesting and valuable chronicles of the modern international socialist and labor movements. The Bureau also made energetic efforts to carry out the unity resolution of the Amsterdam Congress and its efforts have contributed materially to a unification of our comrades in France.

Among the most interesting items in the report of the International Secretary is the fact that the Bureau is in communication with representatives of the socialist movement in China. The Bureau expects that our Chinese comrades will be strong enough by next year to send a delegation to the international socialist convention. The socialists of Cuba and Brazil likewise expect to be represented in the Stuttgart congress.

The Bureau has also made a beginning for the establishment of an international socialist archive which is expected to contain all valuable socialist publications, documents, etc. The number of books and periodicals so far collected already exceeds 15,000.

The annual dues of the various national organizations were re-adjusted by the Bureau at its last meeting. In view of the increased activity of the Bureau and the corresponding increase in its expense, the effect of the re-adjustment was in a majority of cases to raise the annual charges except in cases of the smaller countries in which the charges have been reduced. The socialist movement in the United States is now charged 1250 francs per year instead of 800 francs as heretofore, but it must be borne in mind that our party is only responsible for part of these dues, since the other part must be borne by the Socialist Labor Party, which is now likewise represented on the Bureau.

Probably the most fruitful activity of the International Socialist Bureau within the last year was its support of the revolutionary movement in Russia. The international celebration of the anniversary of "Bloody Sunday" was a complete and emphatic success, and stands without parallel in history as a demonstration of the solidarity of the revolutionary working class the world over. The financial support which the Russian revolutionary movement received through the International Bureau was also very material, and the Bureau succeeded in a number of cases to prevent the extradition of Russian socialists from various European countries either by direct intervention or through the medium of the affiliated parties.

On the whole the International Socialist Bureau apparently begins to realize the great hopes of the socialist movement which attended its creation in 1900, and the time seems to be near at hand when it will become a body more powerful and influential than the General Council of the old International.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) MORRIS HILLQUIT.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

It is interesting and surprising what peculiar political and economic alignments can take place in the short space of a year — how groups of individuals turn a complete flip-flop from one extreme to the other. In the first place certain shining lights among the Socialists assiduously cultivated the notion formerly that industrial organization was pretty much of a failure, that strikes and boycotts had outlived their usefulness, and that the workers must convert their unions into political machines to fight capitalism at the ballot-box, etc. How many times have we heard Debs, De Leon, Hagerty and others expound these and similar views? Then, on the other hand, there was Sam Gompers, Duncan, Mitchell and their followers who made no effort to conceal their contempt for political action. "A strike makes a real man of the most timid slave," I have heard Gompers fairly shout during the heat of debate. I never heard Duncan make a speech in which he did not stretch to his full height (he must be about ten feet high on such occasions) and point with pride to the fact that the granite cutters, the cigar makers and many other union people had obtained through their industrial organizations what had been impossible of attainment in legislative halls up to date — the eight-hour day, more pay, regulation of apprentices and other favorable conditions of work. Mitchell and other brethren also recalled innumerable advantages secured through union effort and in every debate in Federation conventions there was a fine sense of scorn displayed by the pure and simple saints toward the Socialists. The latter were not considered to be good trade unionists; they were referred to as "Socialist politicians," who were seeking to destroy organized labor by injecting political claptrap.

But, presto! the grand transformation scene changes the Socialists into pure and simplers and the pure and simplers into politicians. A year ago the I. W. W. was launched in Chicago, a declaration of principles was formulated in which political action is repudiated in so many words, and many of the spokesmen of the new body have sneered at the idea of dropping pieces of paper in a box and ridiculed the "Slowshulist" party as being a mere reform aggregation. Now it is the strike — the general strike — that will save society, while politics is merely a buffer for capitalism to divert the attention of the workers from the wrongs that are inflicted upon them in the shops, mines, factories, etc. Hagerty has become the purest of pure and simplers. De Leon, having destroyed his own party, is now busily engaged in sowing the seed of dissension in the Socialist party to kill off that promising organization also, and he hails with delight and magnifies, as only De Leon can, every little local factional fight or the withdrawal of the most obscure member of any backwoods branch. Debs, I am informed by comrades of Toledo, where he recently delivered an address, spoke in discouraging tones in private of the political movement, expressing the fear that the S. P. would lose

ground in 1908. Of course, this is mere hearsay, but it reminds me that 'Gene has not displayed nearly as much of his infectious enthusiasm for political action as he has for that wonderful wheel of fortune scheme that is destined to make capitalism quail and plead for its life. Do you think that this sudden whooping and hurrahing for the new industrial organization is not reacting on the Socialist party? It certainly is — at least at present. Several months ago I mentioned the fact in the REVIEW that party members in many sections of the country are putting in more time boosting the I. W. W. than the S. P., and that they are becoming pretty well tangled up in factional quarrels among themselves, with the result that bad blood and jealousies are being aroused and the locals and branches are suffering the consequences.

A case in point is a recent occurrence in Ohio. The Cincinnati comrades became ensnarled in the industrial net. A minority became imbued with the notion that life was hardly worth living if the I. W. W. were not endorsed. They made their fight in the local convention and were defeated, then they appointed themselves fraternal delegates to an alleged state convention of the S. L. P., which met at the same time and place as the S. P. convention. The De Leonite remnant endorsed the I. W. W. and then the "fraternals" were sent over to the S. P., denied the floor for the reason that Cincinnati local was duly represented, and bolted off home, called a meeting of their faction, voted to secede, and, State Secretary Gardner being one of the members, used the state office and the party machinery to create as much trouble throughout Ohio as possible. Several manifestos have been sent out by the little minority rule-or-ruin crowd to the locals in the state, and now there is all kinds of hell to pay, and nobody knows where or when it will stop. Here is one of the significant sentences that appears in the bolter's manifesto: "Division, division, division everywhere. And the motto of the ruling class has ever been: 'Divide and conquer!'" Then follows this concluding paragraph: "Several ward branches have returned their charter to the Socialist party and are reorganizing as branches of the S. L. P." Do you wonder that the capitalist class can sit back and grin at such ridiculous displays of muddle-headedness! Who is creating the "division everywhere," and why must we pass through a second De Leon experience? What is it all about? Why should another party be wrecked for a mere strike and boycott machine! I suppose when a policeman's club comes down on the head of a striker who carries an I. W. W. card it will make less of a dent or leave a smaller lump than on the head of an A. F. of L. member. Maybe when the courts learn that injunctions are to be flung against the unterrified wheel of fortune devotees instead of Fakiration agitators the judges will become panic-stricken and fly to a cyclone cellar. Perhaps the capitalists will be real good and weakly pray for forgiveness when the I. W. W. stalwarts come to town and drive the puny Federationists from the field. It is really astonishing how "bug-house" otherwise earnest and intelligent men can become when they start to worship a fetish, a name, a mere sound. As I stated before, the capitalists of this country, wielding the enormous power that they do, care nothing what form or name the workers are organized under, and probably hardly ever display sufficient interest to inquire, but when they see a head they hit it. They control the powers of government and will order out their militia, hurl their injunctions, hire deputies and thugs to create trouble, oppress men, women and children in every manner possible as quickly in Colorado as in Ohio. Furthermore I am not even prepared to admit that the members of the I. W. W. will display any more unselfishness, fortitude and heroism than A. F. of L. members, or that the former will stick to their organization when the next great panic breaks over the country any more tenaciously than the latter. What has become of the "stonewall," S. T. and L. A., who were supposed to be so much more intelligent than ordinary folk? If

the Socialist philosophy holds true that material interests dominate men's actions, then let the party members join whatever organizations safeguard them best, for industrial associations are, at most, but temporarily alleviating the conditions of the toilers from the pressure of capitalism. My appeal to comrades is to not lose their heads and keep their powder dry. No form of industrial organization is going to solve the labor problem for the packing house employes, the railway workers, the miners, the iron and steel workers, the marine men, or in any other branch of human activity, no matter whether such organization be labeled I. W. W., A. F. of L., K. of L., S. T. and L. A. or whatnot. The experience of the toiling millions of Great Britain, where they have some of the finest purely industrial organizations in the world; on the European continent, where they are fighting for universal suffrage that they may meet the enemy at the polls and in the legislation chambers; in Australia, where the trade unions were shot to pieces, so to speak, and finally took refuge behind the ramparts of their political power; yes, right here in America, where the most reactionary and ultra-conservatives have suddenly begun to appreciate the fact that they must move politically, demonstrates the fact beyond peradventure of doubt that, after all, the ballot is the club that must be used if final emancipation is to be achieved. Let it be understood, once for all, that those who deprecate political action, whether they are found among the old school of pure and simplers or in the new-fangled I. W. W., are anarchists, but lack the courage to so announce themselves. Between the latter and the Socialists there can be no compromise or anything in common. It is the duty of every member of the Socialist party to quit monkeying with old, wornout schemes, irrespective of the highfaluting names they may be paraded under, and to give the best of his talents, time and means to upbuild the Socialist party. We need have no fear of the Bryans and Hearts and Roosevelts, although they may temporarily check our movement here or there. They are less dangerous, however, than those whom the experiences of the past have taught nothing, and who are stampeded by every freak scheme that may be promulgated by some ambitious individual or a coterie of unclear minds who hope to stop comets by passing resolutions. Political action through the Socialist party, I repeat, is the road to final victory. All other movements are ineffectual and more or less humbug.

Meanwhile the original pure and simplers of the A. F. of L. continue to issue their proclamations in favor of political action along certain lines, "to reward our friends and punish our enemies," and where they are all "enemies" to stack up independent tickets. As has already been pointed out in these columns, this policy, if adopted by the members, will do more damage than could have been done if a bold, honest stand had been taken independent of all parties. Cheap skates and petty grafters will take advantage of the opportunity to designate "friends" and "enemies" according to their own selfish plans, and then there will be rows galore. But the indications are that the latest Gompersian policy will meet with little favor in important industrial centres. The rank and file will move ahead of their alleged leaders and nothing will stop them from landing in the Socialist camp sooner or later. Yet one thing has been accomplished by the A. F. of L. executive council in declaring for political action, and which can be applauded by every Socialist no matter what interpretation may be placed on such action, and that is pure and simpledom has heard its death-knell in the Federation, the bars are down and the political issues must be discussed, and the Socialists who have steadfastly fought in conventions in favor of political action have been vindicated. It is now up to the Socialists to make their principles known in the local unions, and then it won't take long to completely down reaction and fossilized conservatism.

On the purely industrial field there have been no great developments

during the past month except that the bituminous miners have nearly all returned to work, having gained their increase of $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, or the 1903 scale. The miners, on their side, made a number of concessions in the various states, but whether they will offset the increase of wages only time will determine. The printers in a number of cities are still fighting for the eight-hour day, and the bookbinders and pressmen are making arrangements to inaugurate national moves to enforce the same demand. The bridge and structural iron workers also continue to fight the American Bridge trust, a constituent part of the United States Steel Corporation, which aims to destroy the union. The officials of the Western Federation of Miners remain in prison, their trial having been postponed again until next winter, the excuse being that the habeas corpus case must be tried in United States Supreme Court, but the actual fact probably is that the prosecution has no evidence to convict. The W. F. of M. executive council has refused to charter Eastern coal miners, which was a wise decision.

There are the usual number of local strikes in progress in many industrial centres, showing that the class struggle has not yet disappeared.

BOOK REVIEWS

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS. By Henry C. Taylor, *The Macmillan Co., Half leather, 327 pp., \$1.25.*

The "Factors of Agricultural Production—Land, Capital-Goods and Population," in the United States, consist of 838,591,777 acres, of which only one-half is improved, with about nine dollars per acre invested capital, and a farming population of a trifle over ten millions. The "Economic Properties" of these various "Factors" are considered and are found to "vary in productivity." From this broader view the transition is at once made to a discussion of "the economic principles which the farmer follows when intelligently seeking to win the largest possible net profits;" "those circumstances under which the winning of the largest net profits on the part of the farmer does not result also in the highest value of the agricultural productions of the country as a whole," and "the methods which have been employed by public authority in its attempts to promote the agricultural interests, and the institutions which are essential to a proper adjustment of the economic relations of those engaged in this industry."

The problems which meet the individual farmer in the distribution of his "factors of production" are considered at some length, and in decidedly academic language, which often serves to give commonplaces, if not platitudes, the aspect of wise observations.

One naturally turns to his chapters on "The Size of Farms" and "The Distribution of Wealth" to discover what valuable social conclusions are arrived at. But such a reader will be grievously disappointed. The size of farms seems to be wholly determined by individual considerations relating to the farmer, while the entire wealth of the farm, according to this author, would seem to be divided between the tenant, landlord, and their employes. There seems to be no grasp of any wider relations between the farm and a great complex system of capitalistic production, which fact is infinitely the most important and distinctive thing about modern agriculture. The doctrine of "diminishing returns" is accepted in its baldest form with never a hint that the whole theory is disputed in its very fundamentals, and certainly does not apply in any such manner as is taken for granted here. There is much that is suggestive and valuable in the short chapter on "The Principles to be followed in Estimating the Value of Farm Lands and Equipments," including some ingenious mathematical formula. It is almost amusing however to see this chapter, by far the most intricate and technical in the book, commended as practical advice to the prospective buyer of farm land. The chapters on "Tenancy and Land-Ownership" and "Landlords and Tenants" are perhaps the best in the book, both because of the treatment of a hitherto neglected subject, and because of its presentation of sample contracts for the renting of land on the share plan. It is

strange, however, to read this contract with its utter disregard of all the Ricardian laws of rent, the productivity of the soil, the proximity to market, etc. and then to turn back to the chapter on the "Organization of the Farm," for instance, where that law of rent is pre-supposed as of universal and active influence.

As one of the first steps in a new field in economics, at least so far as the English language is concerned, the book is to be welcomed without too close examination. It does bring considerable matter of value, and must be read by whoever wishes to enter upon the study of agricultural economics. Yet its short-comings are many. Not to mention the complete disregard of the socialist writings on the subject, both in German and English, to which the author is very careful to avoid all references, — perhaps because some of his pet premises would be upset by them should his readers happen to also become familiar with the socialist works — there is tendency towards the ponderous expression of platitudes, which is all too common in much of present day economic and sociological literature. On pages 94-5, for example, a whole paragraph is devoted to saying that the farmer ought not to use a machine unless it pays. On page 126 we are gravely told as the final result of several pages of reasoning that, "The conclusion is, therefore, that every man who can make more by hiring to a farmer should do so, and every farmer who can increase his net profits by hiring men and increasing the size of his farm, without increasing the amount of effort which he need put forth, should do so." Indeed!

We are also struck with the omissions. As has been already noted, there is no discussion of the law of concentration in agriculture, save in the adjustment of farm labor, no examination of the changes wrought in the whole agricultural situation by the introduction of improved machinery, no historical perspective of any sort, and no recognition of the diverse industries that are comprised under the name of farming. These things are certainly fundamental in character, and germane in subject-matter. Why were they not considered?

THE PLASE OF INDUSTRIES IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION, by Katherine Elizabeth Dopp. Second Edition. University of Chicago Press, Cloth, 270 pp., \$1.00.

We welcome the second edition of this book, and recommend it to every socialist who wishes to know the latest and most practical word on the "new education," which in itself is but a part of the great intellectual political, and fundamentally industrial movement, of which socialism is the largest expression. A full review of this work was given on the appearance, (Vol. IV, p. 186), and this cannot be repeated here. Suffice to say that the industrial evolution is discussed from the lowest stages to capitalism, with the application of the various stages to practical question of education. An additional chapter has been added giving detailed instructions to teachers as to the methods by which to apply the ideas of the book. Numerous illustrations have also been added, which naturally increase the value of the work. Wherever socialists are in any way interested in education,—and they should be so interested everywhere—this book should be carefully studied.

METAMORPHOSE, *Involving Regeneration of Individual and Race, and also the solution of the great Problem of Poverty*, by Orlando K. Fitzsimmons, Progress Publishing Co., Marquette Building, Chicago. Cloth, deckel edgc, 217pp., and Appendix, \$2.00.

This is one of the multitude of confused discussions of social pro-

blems that the last ten years have brought forth. There is a little undigested fraction of nearly all social philosophies, no matter how contradictory, to be found within its pages, and nothing that can be considered a contribution to the subjects attacked.

MODERN JUSTICE, *A Drama in Five Acts*, by Rhoda O. R. Reichel, Published by the Author at St. Paul, Minn. Paper, 79pp.

There have been any number of attempts by amateurs to write socialist plays during the last few years, and none of them can be said to have been extremely successful. Nor is the present one an exception. There is considerable strength to certain portions, but on the whole it is crude and too melo-dramatic.

THE TRI-UNIT PHILOSOPHY, *A Treatise Based on the Discovery of Unit Matter*, by Porter Mellen Jones, M. D. Published by the Author at 312 W. Monroe Str., Chicago, Ill.

A pseudo-scientific work discussing astronomy, geology, and incidentally sociology. It is largely a jargon of scientific terminology with very little meaning, that the reviewer is able to discover.

A HOME COLONY, by Upton Sinclair, The Jungle Publishing Co., Box 2064, New York. Paper, 23pp.

Not a plan for a socialist community, but for a community of socialists, which will solve the servant problem while capitalism remains, and make living a little more endurable for those who are lucky enough to be able to co-operate as suggested.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

WHAT WE DID IN JUNE.

Summer is usually the dull season in the book publishing business. Ordinarily we think ourselves lucky if the sales in June cover the running expenses. In June, 1905, our book sales were \$676.61. In June, 1906, they were \$1527.18. In June, 1905 our receipts from the sale of stock were \$140.55; in June, 1906, the receipts from this source were \$307.72. In June, 1905 the receipts of the International Socialist Review were \$173.77, supplemented by cash donations to the amount of \$227.00. Last month the receipts of the Review were 199.84 while the only donation was \$10 from Jacob Bruning of Chicago.

The meaning of all these figures is that within a year our book publishing business has doubled. We are receiving new stock subscriptions daily, because it has become self-evident that any buyer of socialist books can get more for his money by taking advantage of our plan of co-operation than in any other way.

Donations have fallen off because we are no longer making any special appeal for them. The comrades who can spare but from one to five dollars a month are putting the money into new books, which is far more satisfactory for every one concerned.

Meanwhile the one unsolved problem is the International Review. It has run six years, and it is about as far as ever from paying expenses. The socialist movement is now large enough so that it can support such a periodical with ease if the party members really care to keep in touch with the socialist thought of the world. A net increase of just one thousand subscribers would stop the deficit and enable the publishing house to go on issuing the Review without crippling its other work. But it must be a *net* increase, that is we must not only get a thousand new subscribers, but enough more to make up for the old subscribers who do not renew.

There is just one way to get these subscribers. They will not come of themselves. We might get them by advertising but only by spending on the advertising about all the money received from the subscriptions. The one way they can be obtained is by the personal efforts of readers of the Review who think it worth continuing. That is the only way any socialist publication in America keeps alive, even the most prosperous ones.

SIX MONTHS FOR FIFTY CENTS.

It is easier to get half a dollar than a dollar from a new reader. Moreover, if the subscription list is not substantially enlarged we shall

not publish the Review on its present lines after the end of 1906. We offer no commission on new subscriptions, for to do this would certainly result in the rate to subscribers being cut by those who "rustle" for subscriptions. But as an inducement to send lists of new subscriptions we offer

BOUND VOLUMES FREE.

The sixth volume is now ready. It contains 764 pages with complete index, and it is solidly bound in cloth with gold stamping. The price is \$2.00. But we will mail this volume free to any one sending \$5.00 for the Review six months to ten names. Or send \$25.00 with fifty names for six months and we will send by express prepaid the second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth volumes. These make up an invaluable history of the socialist world-movement and mirror of socialist thought for the years from 1901 to 1906. We do not include the first volume in this special offer for the reason that our supply of it is nearly exhausted. Its price has therefore been raised to \$5.00. A complete set of the six volumes is sold for \$15.00; our stockholders can buy the set for \$7.50 by express at purchaser's expense or \$9.00 including prepayment of charges by us.

WHAT TO READ ON SOCIALISM.

This is a book of 64 large pages, each page containing considerably more matter than a page of the Review. It is a descriptive catalogue of the books of this publishing house, prepared with the idea not of inducing readers by glowing descriptions to buy what they don't want, but of informing them what each book contains and does not contain, so that they may select understandingly the books that they do want. And it is more than a catalogue. It contains an introduction by Charles H. Kerr explaining in the simplest possible style the ideas held in common by international socialists. It is thus in itself an effective piece of propaganda, and as it has the effect of making people buy socialist books, we are able to supply it at less than the cost of printing. The price is one cent a copy including postage either on copies mailed singly or on a bundle to one address. Or we will send copies in any quantity by express at purchaser's expense at 50 cents a hundred.

SUMMER PROPAGANDA PACKAGE.

- The Communist Manifesto, by Marx and Engels, 64 pages, 10 cents.
- Socialism, Utopian and Scientific, by Frederick Engels, 127 pages, 10 cents.
- Socialist Songs, Dialogues and Recitations, compiled by Josephine R. Cole, 55 pages, 25 cents.
- Capital and Labor, by a Black-listed Machinist, 203 pages, 25 cents.
- For Russia's Freedom, by Ernest Poole, 32 pages, 10 cents.
- Class Struggles in America, by A. M. Simons, 64 pages, 10 cents.
- Socialism vs. Single Tax, a Debate between Post, Hardinge and White, single taxers, against Untermann, Stedman and Simons, socialists. 64 pages and eight portraits, 25 cents.
- A Socialist View of Mr. Rockefeller, by John Spargo, 16 pages, 5 cents.
- Science and Life, by Enrico Ferri, 16 pages, 5 cents.
- The Socialist Campaign Book, 151 pages, 25 cents.
- Underfed School Children, the Problem and the Remedy, by John Spargo, 32 pages, 10 cents.

The Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand, by Dr. C. W. Wooldridge, 64 pages, 10 cents.

The Root of All Kinds of Evil, by Rev. Stewart Sheldon, 32 pages, 10 cents.

Forces that Make for Socialism in America, by John Spargo, 32 pages, 10 cents.

A full set of the Madden Library, six booklets of 16 pages each, 10 cents.

These books contain 1112 pages, they retail for two dollars. We will send a full set of them along with 20 copies of What to Read on Socialism, by express at purchaser's expense for one dollar, or for \$1.50 we will send them by mail or express prepaid to any address. This offer is open to any one, whether a stockholder in our publishing house or not, but it will not be good after the last day of August. Better order at once; the offer will not appear in the REVIEW again.

THE INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE.

This new library was started at the beginning of 1906, and eight volumes are now ready. It contains in handsome and substantial form for the library a series of works that are positively indispensable to the student of socialism. The titles of the volumes which can now be supplied are The Changing Order, by Oscar Lovell Triggs, Better-World Philosophy and The Universal Kinship, by J. Howard Moore, Principles of Scientific Socialism, by Charles H. Vail, Some of the Philosophical Essays of Joseph Dietzgen, Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History, by Antonio Labriola, Love's Coming-of-Age, by Edward Carpenter, and Looking Forward, by Philip Rappaport. A descriptive circular of all these books will be mailed to any one asking for it. Three more volumes in this library will soon be ready. Any book in this series will be mailed promptly on receipt of one dollar. The following letter from a famous English author to J. Howard Moore will give some idea of the importance of his book:

A LETTER FROM MONA CAIRD.

"I must send you a few lines to thank you for your splendid book, *The Universal Kinship*, which I have just finished. It leaves me in a glow of enthusiasm and hope. It seems like the embodiment of years of almost despairing effort and pain of all of us who have felt these things. That which we have been thinking and feeling — some in one direction and some in another, some in fuller understanding and breadth, others in little flashes of insight here and there — all seems gathered together, expressed, and given form and color and life in your wonderful book.

We seemed to be working in the cold and dark, derided, and called well-meaning, (most damning of epithets), and compelled to see and know of horrible wrongs practiced, not merely by the base but by some of our otherwise noblest and best. And everywhere the strange, instinctive desire to bolster up and to justify savage survivals as 'manly', wholesome, and all the rest of it.

And now comes your book—which is not merely an emotional statement of the case, but a broad, convincing, and scientific exposition of the whole proposterous situation, fired by feeling and enthusiasm (a splendid blend)—and the whole ghastly nature of our 'civilization' is made so clear that no one can help seeing the truth even though he denies it with his lips.

Your book is very beautiful and grand, if I may speak as I feel; and it gives me more hope than anything I have read for many a year.

Since Evolution has produced this clearness of vision and tenderness of universal sympathy in *one* of our species, time may, surely it *must*, bring the higher view and broader outlook to the average man and woman in the form of a current standard or view.

* * * * *

Please excuse this long letter and accept my warm gratitude for your magnificent contribution to the progress of the world."

Yours very truly,

MONA CAIRD, LONDON.

OUR NEW EDITION OF MARX'S CAPITAL.

More than half the type for this book has already been set, and next month we will announce the date of publication. We have made no great effort as yet to secure advance cash orders for this work, since we do not wish to keep the comrades waiting too long for their books after they have sent in the money. We are sparing no expense to make this the best edition of Marx that can be obtained anywhere. No edition yet published has an alphabetical index; ours will have an excellent one prepared by Ernest Untermann. The price of the first volume, nearly 900 large pages, will be two dollars less the regular discounts to our stockholders. Later we shall issue the second and third volumes, never yet published in the English language, and they will be in uniform style with the first volume, making a set that will be an essential part of every socialist library. It will take twelve hundred dollars within the next few weeks to publish this first volume. For forty dollars received before the end of August we will send forty copies to any stockholder by freight *prepaid*. This will enable the members of almost any city local to get their copies for a dollar each by co-operating in time. Smaller orders from stockholders will be filled at \$1.20 each by mail; \$1.00 each by express. To have books sent by freight it is necessary to order at least twenty dollars' worth at once.

That is about all for this time. We have more new books but no room to tell about them. Our work is growing faster than ever before, because 1412 stockholders are helping it along. If you want it to grow faster still, take hold and help.